UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA

GRADUATE COLLEGE

EDUCATORS' UNDERSTANDING AND IMPLICATIONS OF THE NO CHILD LEFT BEHIND ACT OF 2001

A Dissertation

SUBMITTED TO THE GRADUATE FACULTY

in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the

degree of

DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

BY
SILVYA A. KIRK
Norman, Oklahoma
2005

UMI Number: 3164571

UMI Microform 3164571

ProQuest Information and Learning Company
300 North Zeeb Road
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346

EDUCATORS' UNDERSTANDING AND
IMPLICATIONS OF THE NO CHILD LEFT BEHIND ACT OF 2001

A Dissertation APPROVED FOR THE

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL LEADERSIP
AND POLICY STUDIES

BY

_____
Dr. Jeffrey Maiden, Chair

_____
Dr. Gregg Garn

_____
Dr. George Moore

_____
Dr. Christine Ormsbee

_____
Dr. Courtney Vaughn

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

My sincerest appreciation is expressed to those individuals who encouraged me, supported me, and prayed with me throughout this seemingly impossible task. With their support the impossible dream was made possible.

First and foremost, I must thank the chair of my committee, Dr. Jeffrey Maiden, who has the patience of Job. Without his indefatigable guidance, and belief in me, I would not have completed this program. Also, I certainly want to acknowledge the rest of my committee, Dr. Courtney Vaughn, Dr. Gregg Garn, Dr. Chris Ormsbee, and to my anchor, Dr. George Moore.

Many thanks are genuinely expressed to my wonderful faculty and staff and the student body of Carl Albert High School, Midwest City, Oklahoma. Specifically, I must acknowledge Mr. Ron Springfield (who spent myriad hours proofing and reproofing every page that I wrote), Mr. Rick Mendenhall, Mr. Robert Epps, Mrs. Kathy Hall, Mrs. Carla Dame, and Mr. Jay Price. From the central office of Mid-Del Schools, I thank Dr. Cheryl Steele for her encouragement, Dr. Pam Deering for her continuous advice, Mrs. Kathy Dunn for her assistance and Mr. John Riley for his support and belief in me. I encourage him now to "Keep the Faith."

Throughout this program, the members of my cohort group, Rodney Stearns, Robert Moody, and Dennis Gentry were my barometers. Their encouragement and assistance cannot be quantified.

And now to my family:

To my church family of Tabernacle Baptist Church, especially, Reverend and Mrs. John L. Mayshack, thanks for your prayers.

To my wonderful sorority sisters, the ladies of Alpha Kappa Alpha, Beta Sigma Omega Chapter... thanks for your love and your gentle, “push.”

To my mother, Mrs. Susan A. Davis and my mother-in law, Mrs. Vernita K. Kirk, thank you for your love, concerns, and belief in me.

To my sister, Fontaine Swinson, for your love and belief in me, and to my sisters-in law, (Altamese Toney, Aleta Bray, and Sereetta Kennedy) who have been supporting me and my dreams since “Tuskegee,” thanks for everything.

To my brothers, Joe Johnson and Arthur Johnson, who always remind their, “Big Sis” to “go for it,” and to my “Tuskegee” brothers-in law, (Wendell and Amos)...thanks.

To my nephew-like -son computer “whiz,” Jonathan “Jay” Johnson, who has supported his “auntie” since day one…thanks.

Next, to my loving children, who are truly the centers of my joy: Dana, Shoan, and Rhyan. Always remember that doubt sees the obstacles while faith sees the way. Thanks for not giving up on your mother while she devoted most of her energies to completing this program.

Finally, to my best friend and biggest cheerleader, my husband, Mr. Precel D. Kirk, whose steadfast belief in me, unconditional love and support of my endeavors never falters and who is as proud of me as I am of him…thanks for being you.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

ABSTRACT

Public school educators are required to implement and to meet the goals of the federal education reform, No Child Left Behind Act of 2001. This comprehensive legislation provides a prescriptive format that educators must follow and all children are to improve regardless of ethnicity, gender, socioeconomic status, disabilities, home environment or parental support. Reeves (2003) suggest that the implementation of the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB), particularly, but not limited to, the accountability and assessment provisions requiring all students to meet the academic performance standards established by each state by 2013-2014, will present challenges to districts, schools and educators.

Kane, Staiger and Geppert (2002) imply that NCLB is "seriously flawed" and that the problems embedded in the federal education reform are daunting. They further suggest that while the federal policy was designed to correct problems in public education, it creates myriad other problems.

As schools across the nation implement the new law, the purpose of this study is to examine the understanding of NCLB and its implications as perceived by educators and to determine: 1) if there are any significant differences between classroom teachers and building level administrators in their professed understanding and their perceived implications of NCLB; and 2) to examine differences between educators' of Title I and non-Title I schools understanding and perceived implications of the law

CHAPTER ONE

Introduction

Background

Historically, public education of America's schools was mainly a state and local responsibility with the federal government playing a limited role (Goodlad, 1983, Jennings, 2002, Spring, 1988, Vinovskis, 1995). However, since President Lyndon's establishment of Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) of 1965 as part of the "War on Poverty" the federal government's limited role in public education shifted to a vital role to ensure government funding of educational opportunities (Citizens' Commission on Education, 1999).

While the impact of poverty upon student achievement was debated, (Coleman, Campbell, Hobson, McPartland, Mood, Weinfield, & York, 1966), in April of 1965 Congress declared that

> …it would be the policy of the United States government to provide assistance to local education agencies (LEA) serving areas with concentration of children from low income families to expand and improve their education programs by various means which would contribute to meeting the special needs of educationally deprived children. (Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, sec. 201)

The Eighty-Ninth Congress, along with President Johnson, held high expectations of the legislation. The compensatory programs created under Title I of the ESEA hinged on the conviction that by providing impoverished and disadvantaged children with better educational services, the academic gap between the disadvantaged and the more

advantaged children would eventually be eliminated. Henceforth, America's public schools would improve (Bailey & Mosher, 1968; Bernstein, 1996; Goodlad, 1984, Jeffrey, 1978; Jennings, 2003; Schugrensky, 1996, Vinovskis, 1999).Viewed as an act of "redress," some posed that the compensatory programs established manipulated school conditions in order to raise achievement levels of disadvantaged children (Scheerens, p. 4).

The Title I program, a revenue source for educational assistance to the nation's schools which had high concentrations of disadvantaged children, was broad and pervasive. Schools receiving these resources were expected to enforce equity and promote excellence. ESEA became the nation's promise to help educate disadvantaged children (Jennings, 2002). Schools would become conduits in compensating for the impact of poverty through public education

The ambitious federal strategy was met with mixed emotions from the education community. While school districts embraced the concept of creating better opportunities for the needy, they were wary of the federal government's involvement. Concerned that the new legislation would usurp the traditional role and responsibilities of state departments of education and local education agencies, educators knew that by accepting the grant money from the federal government, they were accepting the federal education policies and regulations that accompanied the resources" (Jennings, 2002, p.15). Preliminary evaluations of Title I of the ESEA of 1965 revealed that most of the schools receiving the funds neither improved nor altered the educational opportunities provided to disadvantaged children. Early criticisms saw the legislation as more of a funding mechanism versus a specific policy designed to help at-risk children (Vinovskis, 1999).

A comprehensive nation-wide study designed by the System Development Corporation was conducted over a three year period to examine the sustaining effects of Title I upon 120,000 elementary students. The results of the study concluded that, as a whole, Title I children demonstrated achievement gains in math and reading compared to non-Title I children. However, the study also revealed that the most impoverished Title I recipients showed little to no achievement gains in math and reading (Carter, 1984). As the effectiveness of Title I was disputed, some researchers maintained that Title I programs such as Headstart had helped to narrow the achievement gap between rich and poor, as well as white and black children (Borman, Stringfield & Slavin, 2001, Cowan, 2003, Goertz & Duffy, 2001).

Two decades after the inception of Title I, the landmark report, *A Nation at Risk*, was published. The report stated that:

> Our once unchallenged preeminence in commerce, industry, science, and technological innovation is being taken over by competitors throughout the world. (*A Nation at Risk*, 1983)

Furthermore, the report speculated that:

> If an unfriendly foreign power had attempted to impose on America the mediocre educational performance that exists today, we might have viewed it as an act of war. As it stands, we have allowed this to happen to ourselves. We have even squandered the gains in student achievement made in the wake of the Sputnik challenge. Moreover, we have dismantled essential support systems that helped make those gains possible. We have, in effect, been committing an act of unthinking, unilateral educational disarmament. (*A Nation At Risk*, 1983)

Public education became the scapegoat as the1983 report sent shock waves across the United States validating mounting public concerns of a failing educational system.

An avalanche of educational reform initiatives occurred in response to *A Nation At Risk* and other reports. An example of these initiatives included broad applications of the works of school reformer, Theodore Sizer, founder of the Coalition of Essential Schools (CES), who outlined a set of principles to guide schools through their improvement efforts. An additional school reformer, Hank Levin, founder of the Accelerated Schools Movement, focused his efforts on catching-up academically at-risk students (Oakes, Hunter, Quartz, Ryan & Lipton, 2000). The Onward to Excellence initiative implemented by the Northwest Regional Education Laboratory (NWREL), linked effective school practices to the restructuring of American schools.

The Elementary and Secondary Education Act, renamed the Hawkins-Stafford School Improvement Act, was reauthorized in 1988 with revisions including accountability in Title I programs. After the release of America 2000, which highlighted weaknesses in public schools, in 1989 President George H.W. Bush convened the Charlottesville Education Conference (also called the Governor's Summit and chaired by then Governor Bill Clinton) to establish national education goals for students to attain by the year 2000. Turning their attention to the "common sense notion that student efforts and achievement are directly affected by the expectations set by parents, teachers, schools, and society at large" (Improving Education Through Standard-Based Reform, 1995), the Governor's Summit adopted six national goals for America's schools.

The goals, encompassing everything from school readiness to school completion and from student achievement to lifelong learning, were designed to be achieved through

coherent, nationwide, systematic education reform (Vinovskis, 1999). This initiative began the federal government's emphasis on results and accountability and provided a framework for states to plan, develop, and implement in their efforts to improve education for all students (Citizens' Commission on Civil Rights, 1999).

These goals were revised and subsequently enacted into law under the Goals 2000: Educate America Act. To some, the goals were unrealistic; to others, the goals increased suspicions of the federal government's role in education. Nonetheless, in October of 1994, the framework of Goals 2000 became the linchpin of the reauthorization of the ESEA of 1965, renamed Improving America's Schools Act (IASA) of 1994.

IASA radically restructured previous reauthorizations of Title I. The new legislation required all states receiving Title I funds to establish and assess challenging academic content and performance standards for students in reading and mathematics. The standards and assessments used to measure the progress of children in Title I schools had to be the same as those used for all children in the state. Moreover, state departments of education, local school boards, and schools would be held accountable to ensure that the standards were met (IASA, 1994).

Viewed by some as a "systemic reform," the legislation provided hopes of totally revitalizing American education, particularly the academic performance of disadvantaged children (Vinovskis, 1999, p.193). Each state was required to submit a plan of education to the U.S. Department of Education for approval. The plan was to describe, in detail, the state's strategy for the implementation of Title I and other federal programs in association with the states' own reform education plan (Citizens' Commission on Civil Rights, 1999). Instead of being just a revenue source, Title I was now a revenue source with

demands of accountability in the teaching and learning of disadvantaged students. However, like its predecessors, "Title I could not close the achievement gap between disadvantaged students and their more affluent counterparts" (Borman & D'Agostino 1996, p. 25).

Despite the radical reform efforts of the IASA, it was criticized by some policymakers as being substantially weak legislation that failed to go far enough. Additionally, some policymakers also criticized the failure of states to comply with the legislation. Seven years after the final deadline had passed for states to meet the primary requirements of the legislation, one-third of the states were still out of compliance or had been granted waivers (Education Week, November 28, 2001; Goertz, 2002; Jennings, 2002). Other policymakers questioned the loftiness of the legislation and stated that the act had gone too far (Puma & Drury, 1999).

On January 8, 2002, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act was reauthorized. Without totally usurping state authority on education, the federal government expanded its role in public education reform through the enacting of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, renamed The No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act (Cowan, 2004). Traditionally, states have the responsibility for public education (Institute for Educational Leadership, 2001, U.S. Constitution, 10th Amendment). NCLB departed from this traditional posture and the belief that federal control of public education would lead to an abuse of federal power with the eroding of local control (Sunderman & Kim, 2004).

The initiative, a hybrid of IASA, is viewed by some as a response to the malcontent of America's public education. Contending that too many children were being

left behind in schools and classrooms across America and calling their performance abysmal, NCLB Title I, Subpart A, makes promises so sweeping that they threaten to increase the level of federal involvement in education for years to come (The White House, 2002). At the heart of the legislation is accountability and assessment. The goals of the legislation mandates that (1) all students will reach high standards, at a minimum attaining proficiency or better in reading and language arts and mathematics by 2013-2014; (2) all limited English proficient (LEP) students will become proficient in English and reach high standards and that at a minimum these students will attain proficiency or better in reading/language arts and mathematics; (3) by 2005-2006, all students will be taught by highly qualified teachers; (4) all students will be educated in learning environments that are safe, drug free and conducive to learning; and (5) that by 2014, all students will graduate from high schools (Oklahoma State Department of Education, 2003, P.L. 107-110).

Each of the goals provide a prescriptive format that states must follow mandating that all children are to improve regardless of ethnicity, gender, socioeconomic status, disabilities, home environment, or parental support. Schools and school districts, along with each State Department of Education, will be held accountable for student failure. The consequences of failure will result in actions taken by the federal government upon the specific education agency to eliminate the problem. Despite the federal government's fiscal role in public education being limited, every state, in order to receive federal aid, must implement the provisions of the law (Peterson, 2003). Therefore, ignoring the problem would mean the loss of federal funding which could place a larger burden on states and local school boards to generate revenues lost. Jennings (2003) cites that most

state officials are not opposed to the goals of NCLB; rather, they object to the inflexible and punitive nature of the act along with mandated funding that will further deplete already financially distressed school districts (Jennings, 2003).

Title I, the primary source of funding under ESEA, "allocates funds to more than 90% of the nation's school districts"(Cowan, 2004, p.11). Title I of the Act also outlined the basic program requirements and was the federal government's tactic in assisting disadvantaged children. The new legislative purpose of Title I is to close the achievement gap between high and low performing children; minority and majority students; as well as the academic performance gap between disadvantaged children and their more advantaged peers (P.L. 107-110). The performance of children on each state's assessment will be disaggregated by race, ethnicity, gender, socioeconomic status, disability, migrant status, and limited English proficient students to determine if schools and school districts are closing the achievement gap. In addition, no less than 95% of each subgroup must be assessed and all subgroups must make adequate yearly progress (AYP) as defined by the state. Failure to make AYP for two consecutive years will generate sanctions levied upon the school and the district. Sanctions will also be levied if less than 95% of one or more subgroups fails to take the assessment (P.L. 107-110).

Historically, states have been afforded self-sufficiency in public education, due in part to the structure of the fifty different education systems and methods for financing. The educational systems of states vary in size, capacity, expertise, belief, and traditions, to name a few (Sunderman & Kim, 2004, p. 5). Under No Child Left Behind, there is no state autonomy (Sunderman & Kim, 2004, p. 5). The requirements mandated in the new legislation do not consider state differences or state policies.

As some experts and policymakers debate NCLB, school officials, administrators and teachers are struggling to understand key provisions of NCLB and its implications (Jennings, 2003). Accountability and assessment, the measuring stick of the legislation, is touted as being the most rigid in the history of American public education.

Statement of the Problem

NCLB enacted rigid new mandates that hold states, districts, and schools accountable for improving student academic performance. The federal government has taken an unwavering posture with tough rhetoric, stringent demands, and costly consequences to states, districts, and schools failing to meet the provisions outlined in NCLB. Many states, including Oklahoma, have implemented standards-based reform priorities designed to improve academic performance through accountability (Oklahoma State Department of Education, 1993). However, under the legal arm of Title I, NCLB increases accountability for the academic improvement of all students by linking federal dollars to specific performance goals to ensure improved results (The White House, 2002).

Schools are mandated to have all students proficient by school year 2013-2014. The level of proficiency is to be defined and all performance exams are to be inclusive of all students. Additionally, states are to analyze and report the test results in a manner that speaks to the proficiency of the students and the qualifications of the teachers. States are also called to task by providing technical assistance to under-performing schools.

School districts, on the other hand, must raise test scores in selected core subjects, close the achievement gap, attract and hire highly qualified teachers, design a school choice program, and the list goes on. Inherent in the measures outlined in NCLB is

funding of which the federal government is projected to allocate approximately 7% (Jennings, 2002). What will this mean for already financially strapped school districts who cannot afford to lose the 7% from the federal government and what are the implications for struggling schools that are already labeled as under-performing?

The implementation of Title I of NCLB promises to present some challenges to schools and school districts across the nation. School officials, including building level administrators and classroom teachers, are required to know and to put into practice the mandated programs and provisions to assure the federal government that no child in public schools will be left behind. Due to the relative newness of the Act, this researcher came across no documented studies about primary stakeholders professed understanding and perceived implications of the legislation.

Purpose of the Study

This study will investigate the extent to which administrators and teachers profess to understand the NCLB Act and what they perceive to be the implications of the Act. To achieve this purpose, the research questions addressed in the study are:

1. To what extent do classroom teachers profess to understand the provisions of Title I of the No Child Left Behind Act?
2. To what extent do principals profess to understand the provisions of Title I of the No Child Left Behind Act?
3. Are there statistically significant differences in the extent of understanding provisions of Title I of the No Child Left Behind Act between principals and classroom teachers?
4. Are there statistically significant differences between educators in Title I

schools and in non-Title I schools in their understanding of the Title I provisions of the No Child Left Behind Act?

5. What do classroom teachers believe to be the implications of the No Child Left Behind Act?
6. What do principals believe to be the implications of the No Child Left Behind Act?
7. Are there statistically significant differences between classroom teachers and principals regarding the implications of the No Child Left Behind Act?
8. Are there statistically significant differences between educators in Title I and non-Title I schools regarding the implications of No Child Left Behind?

Significance of the Study

According to Sunderman and Kim (2004), "school officials and experts on education reform were largely excluded from the process of designing the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001; and, yet, they are the ones held accountable for the implementation of the legislation" (p. 78). Additionally, the legislation mandates new requirements for classroom teachers while holding principals responsible for school improvement with consequences for failure imposed upon both education groups (P.L. 107-110). With the responsibility of the legislation placed upon the shoulders of these educators, it is important to know if they understand the new Title I law and to determine, from the educators' perspective, how the new legislation will or could impact them or their schools.

There are few, if any, studies that have investigated the understanding and perceptions of classroom teachers and principals of Title I of NCLB. This study will

contribute to both research and practice. Given the high stakes of the legislation and the rigorous demands placed upon classroom teachers and school principals, this study is intended to make contributions to public education practitioners. The results of the study could also contribute in the decision making of policymakers and legislators in future revisions of the legislation.

Limitations of the Study

The limitations of this study will include:

1. The study is limited to Title I, Subpart A of NCLB.
2. The findings of the study will be limited to the Title I, Subpart A of NCLB.
3. This study will be based on Oklahoma educators only, potentially limiting generalizability.
4. Classroom teachers and building level administrators will be selected based on possessing a minimum of two years of teaching and/or administrative experience and their willingness to participate in the study.
5. This study is limited to the reauthorized NCLB enacted on January 8, 2002. As the legislation continues to evolve, this study will not address any revisions or modifications to the law.

Definition of Terms

Accountability –the testing and measuring of academic performance standards to determine if the standards have been reached with penalties and rewards linked to performance on the tests (P.L. 107-110).

Administrators - currently employed building level administrators (principals) in public schools.

Classroom Teachers – a currently employed certified or licensed person who is employed to serve in an instructional capacity in a public school.

Educators-currently employed classroom teachers or building level principals.

Schools - (Oklahoma Statute Title 70-1-106) all free schools grades K-12, supported by public taxation.

School Districts- (Oklahoma Statutes Title 70-1-108), any area or territory comprising a legal entity, whose primary purpose is the providing of free education for kindergarten through twelfth grade and whose boundary lines is a matter of public record.

Unfunded Mandates – are defined in this study as federally authorized sanctions without sufficient federal funding (Cowan, 2003).

Assumptions

One of the underlying assumptions in this study will be that the responses provided by the classroom teachers and school administrators are genuine. Also, another assumption is that the responses reflect the participants' understanding and perceived implications of Title I, Subpart A of NCLB.

Summary

This chapter included a brief overview of the historical background of Title I of NCLB. Relevant accountability and assessment issues were identified and described. This chapter provided the purpose of the study and the statement of the problem, with a limited amount of research available to research its significance. The limitations of the study were discussed as well as the assumptions for this study. Chapter Two presents a review of the literature related to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 and its reauthorizations leading to NCLB. An overview of federal and Oklahoma education reform will be discussed.

CHAPTER TWO

Review of Literature

This chapter will review literature related to Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) of 1965, along with other educational proposals that shaped the basic course of action for the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB). (Peterson, 2004). Because this study will focus on the professed understanding and perceived implications of the goals of Title I in NCLB, the review of literature will take an in-depth look at Title I initiatives and legislations prior to NCLB.

It is important to review previous Title I legislations in order to identify the changes in the new Title I of 2001 and the concomitant implications as perceived by educators. This chapter will be divided into four main sections: (a) a review of the history of Title I and the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, (b) Title I revisions and federal education reform in the United States from 1970 to 1994, (c) educational accountability and the Improving America's School Act of 1994, and (d) a summary NCLB as the legislative and academic framework of the study.

A Historical Review of Title I and the Elementary and Secondary Education Act

Title I, under the ESEA of 1965 and its various reauthorizations, has served as the nucleus for the federal government to serve disadvantaged and impoverished children since its inception. Throughout its almost forty year history, the Act has undergone revisions to ensure that the federal funds allocated were enhancing American public education and that the needs of disadvantaged children were met (Citizens' Commission on Civil Rights, 1999, Vinovskis, 1999).

Title I began its journey on the heels of the Civil Rights Movement in the 1950s and 1960s. In 1954, the Supreme Court struck down the legal arm separating African American children from White children in public schools. The Court in *Brown v. Board of Education* concluded that "in the field of public education the doctrine of separate but equal has no place" (*Brown v. Board of Education*, 1954). This landmark case paved the way for federal action in providing equal access to African American children attending public schools and the protection of their civil rights (*Brown v. Board of Education*, 1954).

Tension and rebellion carried the landmark decision into the 1960s. The Brown ruling became a source of contention as public schools across America grappled with integrating African American children into traditionally segregated classrooms. Debate surfaced questioning the quality of education being provided to African American children, as well as to poor and disadvantaged children (Johnson, 1965).

With the election of John F. Kennedy as president in 1960, African Americans gained an ally. Kennedy submitted legislative proposals to Congress to help alleviate the "cycle of poverty" (Johnson, 1965) impacting the poor and disadvantaged generally, and African Americans specifically. These proposals met with opposition as the politics of education took center stage. Some of the career politicians feared the impact of integration while others feared that federal funding would lead to too much government involvement in education (Jennings, 2003).

Kennedy's assassination in 1963 elevated Lyndon B. Johnson to the presidency. Johnson, convinced that poverty impacted education, was successful in persuading Congress to pass one of the most significant pieces of legislation in the history of the

United States, the Civil Rights Act of 1964. The signing of this law brought the relationships between schools and poverty along with inequality and segregation to the national spotlight. “Schools failing to comply with the binding and nonbonding regulations in the act could lose federal funding” (Horn, 2002, p. 44).

The 1964 Civil Rights Act authorized sociologist James Coleman to conduct a study examining the scope and causes of the inequality of educational opportunity in America as it related to color, race, national origin, and religion (Civil Rights Act of 1964, Sec. 402). Supporters of the study believed that its results would “find inequalities in the resources received by communities in different schools which would justify massive federal intervention to poverty-stricken schools” (Thrupp, 1999, p. 14). The report (the Coleman Report), entitled, *Equality of Educational Opportunity,* suggested that although small inequities existed in the distribution of resources to schools, found that a student’s family background, the social composition of the school, and the conditions of their environment were more related to their academic achievement than any other factors (Coleman, et al., 1966). The report further concluded that deprived African American children attending ethnically integrated schools performed better academically (Coleman, et al., 1966; Hoff, 1999; Strupp, 1999).

With Johnson’s “War on Poverty” and his desire to build a “Great Society” void of the “crushing weight of poverty,” the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) of 1965 was enacted. Johnson asserted that the answer to all of the nation’s problems was linked to education and poverty (Vinovski, 1999).

The ESEA of 1965 stated that:

> In recognition of the special educational needs of low-income families and the impact that concentration of low-income families have on the ability of local educational agencies to support adequate educational programs, the Congress hereby declares it to be the policy of the United States to provide financial assistance to local educational agencies serving areas with concentrations of children from low-income families to expand and improve their educational program by various means, which will contribute to meeting the special needs of educationally deprived children. (ESEA, sect. 201)

With the passage of the ESEA, the federal government began expanding its role in public education and the underpinning of the ESEA, Title I, was sanctioned.

Title I personified the goal of ESEA with its stated purpose to compensate low-income children by directing millions of federal dollars for remedial programs to schools with a large number of poor and disadvantaged children (ESEA, sect. 201). An "act of redress" (principle that children from low-income homes required more educational services than children from more affluent homes), Title I was designed to ameliorate the impact of poverty and to improve educational programs which would contribute to meeting the needs of educationally deprived children (Puma & Drury, 2000).

The educational programs and services outlined in Title 1 of the ESEA of 1965 included its key program, "Head Start (a preschool program for disadvantaged children aimed at equalizing equality of opportunity based on 'readiness' for the first grade), Follow-Through (programs designed to compliment the gains made by children who participated in the Head Start Program), Bilingual Education (programs implemented to

provide assistance to limited English speaking students) and innumerable programs offering counseling and guidance to disadvantaged children"(Schugrensky, 1996). The Title I compensation programs hinged on the conviction that by providing the poor and disadvantaged students with better educational services, America's public schools would improve (Jennings, 2003; Schugrensky, 1996).

An important characteristic of Title I of the ESEA of 1965 was that it provided broad funding with some flexibility. Local school districts were given the authority to decide on how and where to allocate the funds. Local decisions included the types of services provided to students, the content areas targeted for supplemental assistance, and the staff employed. In effect, the success or failure of Title I was dependent upon how well the local education agencies (LEAs) allocated the funds to serve the needs of their disadvantaged children (Jennings, 2000).

Premature evaluations of the programs established under Title I of the ESEA yielded poor results regarding the effect of Title I on the achievement of students (Ravitch, 1985). Arguments that Title I programs should have focused more on school reform rather than on individual groups gained momentum from the education community (Horn, 2002).

Generally, school districts embraced the concept of creating better opportunities for the disadvantaged students. However, some were wary of the government's involvement and feared federal control of the curriculum (Orfield, 2004). State Departments of Education and local school districts understood that by accepting the Title I grant money from the federal government, they also accepted the conditions that accompanied the funds. Fear of national control over public education was minimized,

however, when Congress passed P.L. 89-10, sect.604, which prohibited federal control (H.R. 103-65).

Title I Revisions and Federal Education Reform: 1970-1994

During the latter parts of the 1960s and into the 1970s, Title I fostered an evolution in American public schools. Federal guidelines were enacted directing school districts to structure Title 1 services separate from the regular classroom. The purse string was tightened on LEA's to assure that categorical aid provided under Title I would not be used as general aid. The federal government and the states that were targeted for particular categories of children or families, special programs and special purposes allocated categorical aid. General aid provided funds that could be used for any expenditure that the district deemed necessary. The amount of categorical aid varied according to the characteristics of the district's student population.

The "supplement not supplant" provision outlined in the legislation made it clear to LEA's that Title I funds were additional dollars. States were compelled to allocate funds from state and local budgets to augment Title I funds. These funds were to be used for the education of deprived children (Jennings, 2000).

Millions of poor and disadvantaged students were provided resources to improve their education in order to narrow the academic gap between themselves and their more affluent peers. The resources provided (mostly at the elementary level) consisted of concentrated instruction both in and out of the classroom, including speech, reading and math laboratories, early start for preschoolers, etc. (Jennings, 2002).

As the years progressed, court rulings and studies authorized by the federal government inspired state and federal mandates. These directives would impact

American public education and future revisions of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. Among others, Jencks (1972) revisited the Coleman Report and concluded that it showed that "poor academic performance was not the result of racial inequality but rather of the social class of the family" (Horn, 2002, p. 73). As a result, some policymakers viewed socioeconomic status and social class as credible gauges in predicting the academic performance of disadvantaged children (Horn, 2002).

Relevant to this, in 1974 the Supreme Court in *Lau v. Nichols* required local school districts to make special allowances for students who did not speak English. In 1975, Congress passed the Rehabilitation Act and Education for All Handicapped Children (P.L. 94-142), which mandated a "free and appropriate" education for children with disabilities. Specifically, the Act was enacted to protect the rights of children with disabilities against discrimination by requiring the mainstreaming of those children into regular education classrooms (P.L. 94-142).

The adequate funding of public schools attended by underprivileged children was also debated. The California Supreme Court in the 1971 *Serrano v. Priest* (*Serrano v. Priest*, 1971) ruled California's school finance system illegal because it allocated fewer dollars to public schools attended by disadvantaged students. The practice of ability grouping was also debated. In 1976, a district court in Washington, D.C., ruled in *Hobson v. Hanson* that the practice of ability grouping in public schools discriminated against black students. The *Hobson v. Hanson* ruling was later overturned; however, it paved the way for further revisions of ESEA (Oakes, Quartz, Ryan & Lipton, 2000).

In 1979, President Carter expanded the role of the federal government in public education by establishing the U.S. Department of Education headed by a Secretary of

Education, who was granted complete status as a member of the President's cabinet. The formation of the U.S. Department of Education met with some apprehension as state departments of education and local school districts again expressed concern over the federal government's increasing role in control of public education (Horn, 2002).

In 1980, political rhetoric dominated the education landscape calling for the repeal of ESEA and the Title I federal programs for the disadvantaged. Critics called the legislation wasteful and inefficient. President Ronald Reagan denounced the federal aid legislation and crusaded for dramatic changes in public education (Puma & Drury, 2000). With the support of others, Reagan campaigned for Congress to pass the Education Consolidation and Improvement Act (ECIA).

With reauthorization under ECIA in 1981, Title I was changed to Chapter I. Most of the goals of the original ESEA were maintained in ECIA. However, several programs were cut and block grants were introduced to give states more control over the distribution of federal education funds. Public discontent of public education continued to mount including that of President Ronald Reagan who criticized the performance of America's public schools. In 1983, Reagan's criticisms were seemingly validated by the publication of *A Nation at Risk*.

Commissioned by the Secretary of Education, T. H. Bell, the National Commission on Excellence in Education was formed in response to public perception that something was seriously flawed in the American education system. The charge of the commission was to analyze and present its findings on the quality of education in America (*A Nation at Risk*, 1983).

The Commission concluded that the educational system in America was at risk. Evidence that the American education system was losing ground included data showing deficiencies in secondary science achievement scores, literacy rate, mathematics, and a steady decline on the Scholastic Aptitude Tests (SAT) since 1963. Consequently, the findings of the Commission determined that there was an absence of standards in America's public schools which contributed to students' performing poorly on standardized tests as well as their failure to enroll in academically challenging courses (Horn, 2002; Reese, 2000).

This report of rising mediocrity escalated citizens' concerns for the inability of America's students to function in society. An avalanche of national reports and educational reform initiative scattered the landscape (Krason, 1992). The initiatives were directed at making students work harder instead of changing the essential issues of the school system. Rigorous academic standards for students and higher standards for teachers were viewed as the means to moving American public education out of mediocrity (Puma & Drury, 2000).

A Nation at Risk became the impetus for waves of school improvement reform as the quality of American public education was debated. The Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy published *A Nation Prepared: Teachers for the 21st Century* in 1986, adding to the demands for standards and accountability in public education. The report, acknowledged the need for a professional milieu empowering teachers to determine how best to meet state and local goals for children but holding them responsible for student growth and academic performance and punctuated the thesis of *A Nation at Risk* in

calling for the implementation of " national teacher standards and the restructuring of public schools" (Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy, 1986, p. 26).

In contrast to *A Nation at Risk*, the Sandia Report (1993), commissioned by George H. W. Bush in 1990 but not widely disseminated (Bracey, 2003), acknowledged that there were numerous problems in public education but concluded that American public education was not in a crisis (Berliner & Biddle, 1995; Sandia National Laboratories, 1993; Stedman, 1994,). The theory propounded by the Sandia Report found that despite bussing, ability grouping and inadequate resources to impoverished and disabled students, significant academic gains were made particularly among high achieving students (Schapiro, 2001).

Funding cuts were initiated that were intended to increase accountability through fiscal expenditures. This trend of funding cuts complete with fiscal mechanisms continued until the mid 1980s. Chapter I continued as the major federal program to aid disadvantaged children, but support of Chapter I federal funding witnessed a decline as the emphasis shifted from fiscal compliance and compensatory issues to a heightened concern for program excellence and raising student achievement (Puma & Drury, 2000).

In 1988, the ESEA of 1965 was reauthorized under the Hawkins-Stafford School Improvement Act. Standards were formally introduced to agencies receiving Title I funds. States were now required to implement academic standards for disadvantaged children at all schools receiving Title I funds. This legislation further required low performing schools, those that did not meet the state standards, to be identified (Hawkins-Stafford School Improvement Act, 1988).

As a result, this legislation provided the motivation for President George H.W. Bush and the state governors to convene an education summit to draft a plan to raise the academic performance of American students. That meeting spawned Goals 2000 (H.R. 103-65).

The crafting of Goals 2000 called for six national education goals for America's children through "coherent, nationwide, systemic education reform" (Vinovskis, 1999, p. 383). The dominant theme of Goals 2000 was the establishment and regulation of outcomes in America's public school (Hanushek, 1997). Policymakers were shifting from their traditional role of regulating schools through imposing explicit input to more of a focus on output, specifically student performance (Evers & Wilber, 1997). The performance goals to be achieved by the year 2000 included: 1) increasing high school graduation rate to 90 %; 2) students were to demonstrate competency in core courses; 3) high schools students were to be proficient in science and mathematics; 4) all children were expected to start school ready to learn; 5) a demand for safe and drug-free schools; and 6) an emphasis on increasing adult literacy, teacher education, and professional development; student achievement and citizenship; and parental participation (Bowsher, 2001; Reese, 2000).

In retrospect, schools did not reach all of these goals by the year 2000. The proposed national reform strategies, however, uncovered deficiencies in Title I, particularly those related to accountability (Puma &Drury, 2000). In 1993, Goals 2000 became an integral part of Bill Clinton's "Goals 2000: Educate America Act." The legislation provided federal aid to states to develop academic standards, define levels of

mastery, and to initiate testing in order to ascertain whether students had reached levels of proficiency (Seiden, 1996).

In 1994, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 was reauthorized and rewritten to explicitly address academic standards for educationally disadvantaged children. Renamed the Improving America's Schools Act (IASA) of 1994, the revised legislation changed the direction of federal Title I programs. The new legislation demanded standards-based education, which mandated the creation of state level high academic standards, coordinated with authentic student assessment that was linked to local school curriculum and practices. The IASA of 1994 provided a systemic reform for Title I. The IASA complemented the Goals 2000: Educate America Act and the School-to-Work Opportunities Act. The compensatory programs authorized in the original Title I in the ESEA of 1965 were overhauled to focus on high standards instead of remedial skills (Citizens' Commission on Civil Rights, 1999).

Title I was further amended to embrace a school wide focus on improving teaching and learning. In addition, the act provided for school flexibility in teacher decision-making in exchange for more accountability for student performance.

Under the accountability proviso of the IASA, states were held responsible for having in place high academic content standards that all students, including educationally deprived children, were to work towards. Districts could not have different standards for Title I students and non-Title I students (S. R. 103-292).

The challenging academic standards, developed by the states, were to be adopted in math, reading, and language arts. States had the option of adopting standards in other disciplines, but under the federal regulation these three areas were mandated. With the

standards came levels of competency whereby all students were expected to attain a minimum level of proficiency (H-R. 103-65).

An authentic assessment instrument to measure proficiency was to be developed by the states and administered to students in each of the three grade level spans (3-5, 6-9, and 10-12). A given state's assessments were required to be aligned with that state's content standards in order for these assessments to be valid. All students were expected to take the tests, with the exception of students new to the school and specific categories of special needs students (profoundly retarded, etc.), who were to be administered an alternative assessment. Student performance on the assessment was to be disaggregated and reported by ethnicity, gender, socioeconomic and migrant status, limited English proficiency, and disability (H-R. 103-65).

States were granted authority to define and determine Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP). Each of the fifty states had to include, in its definition, established criteria that called for continuous and substantial improvement for each district and school that would meet and achieve the goal of all students served by Title I at a proficient level.

If a school failed to make AYP and was identified as a school in need of improvement, parents (who were given enormous latitude in the law) were to be granted the option to transfer their child to a school of their choice in the district. If student transfers were barred by state Statute, however, then state provisions would prevail. Districts could also control choices for multiple reasons including limits on desegregation plans. Ultimately, if a school failed to make AYP for four consecutive years, corrective actions were to be taken by the district. The actions to be taken by districts for consistently failing schools included:

1. Withholding Title I funds;
2. Alternative governance (charter school);
3. Revocation of authority to operate a Title I school wide program;
4. School restructuring; and
5. Decreased administrator- management authority (H-R. 103-65).

Any district that failed to make AYP was chastised by the state. If a district was identified by the state as failing to make AYP for four consecutive years, the state could take the following corrective actions:

1. Withhold Title I funds from the district;
2. Abolish or restructure the district;
3. Send students to schools in districts meeting AYP;
4. Remove specific schools from district's control; and
5. Implement a joint district-state improvement plan (H-R. 103-65).

Those Title I schools and districts failing to make adequate progress were to be publicly identified and placed on an improvement plan (H-R. 103-65). However, very few states developed accountability procedures for districts and few, if any, identified low performing local education agencies.

Title I program funding under IASA would be the largest single federal investment in public education, according to the reauthorization. Almost $7 billion was to be awarded to schools across the country to improve education for children at risk who lived in low-income communities. Target formula grants were created as a means of allocating funds to states that in turn awarded the grants to the districts. To be eligible for funding, districts had to have a minimum of 10 formula (poor) children ages 5-17 that

made up at least 10% of the district's population. The formula allowed the funds to be proportionally distributed to districts with the highest percentage of disadvantaged students.

Educational Finance Incentive Grants were introduced in the IASA that implemented two sets of competencies. These competencies, identified as the effort and equity factors, served to equalize state funding in direct proportion to monies that states spent, per pupil, as compared to the per capita income of other states. The equity factor weighted Title I formula children in districts with high concentrations of disadvantaged children (S. R.103-292). In order to shield districts receiving Title I funds from a dramatic drop in funding, a Hold Harmless provision was enacted which guaranteed districts 85% to 95% of the previous year's funds. States were permitted to encumber 1% of their Title I funds for administrative costs.

Another major change in the IASA was requiring highly qualified teachers and paraprofessionals in Title I programs who were paid with Title I funds. The IASA failed to provide a definition of a highly qualified teacher, but a highly qualified paraprofessional was defined as a supervised aid that held a high school diploma or a GED (S. R.103-292).

The fundamental changes made in Title I of the IASA provided states with more flexibility in the utilization of federal funds. The poverty threshold was lowered to 50%, allowing schools for the first time to use Title I funds to enhance the entire school. Congress, in 1997, authorized additional funding to increase the academic performance of disadvantaged students through school wide, research- based methodologies (American Institute for Research, 1999). Despite such efforts, the funding provided by

the federal government for Title I programs were inadequate. In fact, the federal government contributed only about 7% of the total funds needed and left the rest to the states (S.R. 103-292). Chandler (1995) argued that since Congress imposed the new provisions under IASA on states and local education agencies to implement that they were responsible for appropriating the necessary funds to accomplish the goals of the legislation.

Educational Accountability of the Improving America's Schools Act (IASA) of 1994

The single barometer gauging the effectiveness of IASA was educational accountability. The endorsement of accountability to determine effectiveness centered on good educational practices that led to student learning (Carney, Elmore, et al. 2003). Researchers, theorists, legislators, and the education community at large attempted to define educational accountability.

Wagner and Routledge (1989) defined educational accountability as the results and outcomes that educators should pursue with children. According to Lynn Olson of Education Week (2001), accountability seeks to "ensure that children are getting a good education" (p. 24). Goertz (2002) described successful accountability systems as ones that ensure that state standards are in place via the curriculum and instructions. Test data are analyzed with results implemented in teaching practices to ensuring that students demonstrate continuous progress (Ever & Walberg, 2002).

Accountability as defined by Elmore, Abelman, and Fuhrman (1996) focused on student results with the quality of schools being judged by those results. They concluded that accountability is "an arrangement whereby an account must be given to some authority" (Carnoy, M., Elmore, R., & Siskins, L., 2003). Leithwood, Edge, and Jantzi

(1996) defined accountability as "the use of tests, procedures, methods, or a series of task used to obtain student learning, which are then used to guide decisions and actions regarding student learning, curricular, and instructions" (p. 24).

Critics of school accountability argue the overall expenses of school accountability systems and the quality of tests and high stakes consequences (Ever & Walberg, 2002; Skrla & Scheurich, 2004). Finn (2002) posited that accountability in education is tough, but it must be given an opportunity.

Under the IASA, states and school officials were held responsible for implementing a comprehensive accountability system for all Title I schools. The foundation of the accountability systems was state level academic standards for all students and monitored student growth and performance. States were to submit their accountability systems to the U.S. Department of Education, which called for the "identification of schools and districts with unacceptable performance and growth and provided assistance and /or intervention when necessary" (North Carolina Department of Public Instructions, 1997, p. 9).

Although IASA was enacted in 1994, states had until 2001 to design and submit their accountability system to the U.S. Department of Education. By January 2001, only eleven states were in compliance of the law (*Education Week*, January 2001). Six states had received conditional approval, pending meeting the testing requirements of Title I. Fourteen states had received waivers (granted more time to complete the plan), and sixteen state assessment systems were evaluated past the due date of the plan (*Education Week*, 2001).

The role of the Federal government was challenged in the mid 1990s. Congress

was called upon to repeal some of the federal programs implemented under Goals: 2000 and the Improving America's School Act of 1994. Appropriation bills were enacted to cut education funding. However, during the late 1990s, responses to the federal government's attempt to repeal spending in education fostered substantial funding increases in Title I programs (Puma &Drury, 2000). This increase in Title I funding provided school districts across the nation with approximately 8% of its budget, a slight increase over the previous year's spending (Puma & Drury, 2000).

Despite efforts to provide a quality education and to bridge the academic gap between the rich and poor by providing federal aid, evaluations of Title I programs and their effectiveness continued to produce mixed results. Some critics argued that the benefits of Title I programs had been watered-down by a political push to provide "something for everybody" (Jennings, 2000, p. 518). Although the minor increase in Title I funding was still inadequate to support services for all eligible students, the evidence compiled by Puma (2000), suggested that the funds were reaching the population of students with the greatest needs.

Rees (1998) along with others, suggested that it was time to overhaul IASA. Asserting that despite the fact that over $100 billion had been allocated to Title I programs since its origin, Rees postulated that the federal policy had not accomplished its goal. Her findings, based on a Pew Poll as well as an analysis of the performance of students on a reading test administered by the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), reflected declining test scores and school failures. Preliminary data comparing the performance of high school seniors in Advanced Physics to students in

Western Europe also suggested that the federal policy had failed and that it was time to revise IASA and Title I.

Grissmer (1994) researched the effectiveness of Title I and determined that schools had made substantial improvement in diminishing inequities between minority and non-minority students. He further stated that the increase in academic achievement for minority students was consistent with the effects that might be expected when changing public policies directed at providing equal educational opportunities and increased levels of public investment (Grissmer, 1994).

Jennings (2000) challenged the arguments assailing the effectiveness of Title I. Citing some of the accomplishments, Jennings stated that:

> Title I focuses on critical additional dollars on schools with low-income students. Congress' General Accounting Office found that, thanks to Title I, education funding targeted on poor children was 77 % higher than it otherwise would have been. Furthermore, 46 % of Title I funds go to the very poorest 15 % of all schools, and nearly three-fourths go to schools where the majority of children are poor, according to the U.S. Department of Education. Title I has helped to raise the academic achievement of minority and poor children. Recent research shows that additional funding has a greater impact on the achievement of minority and disadvantaged students than on the achievement of more advantaged students. The largest gain in test scores over the past 30 years have been made by African Americans, Hispanic, and white disadvantaged children. In fact, one-third

to one-half of the gap between African American and white students closed during that period. (Education Week, January 26, 2000)

Despite assertions detailing the success of Title I (Jennings, 2000, Robelen, 1999), momentum gained urging Congress to redefine the role of government in public education, specifically the revision of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, IASA (Rees, 1998). President Clinton, prior to the expiration of his second term of office, proposed to Congress the reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to be entitled, The Educational Excellence for All Children Act of 1999. The new proposal addressed the weaknesses of Improving America's School Act of 1994. The proposed legislation was never enacted because of the change in presidential administration.

Education Reform and No Child Left Behind

The revised federal education reform of 2001, the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB), increased emphasis on accountability (Stecher & Kirby, 2004). Broder (2001) stated that the NCLB legislation " was possibly the most important federal education reform since the inception of ESEA" (p. 23).

The reauthorized NCLB has some continuity with IASA (Sunderman & Kim, 2004). However, NCLB is more performance based and focuses on scientifically proven research (Stecher & Kirby, 2004). Supporters of the legislation argue that previous education reform efforts focused too much on input (measures such as fiscal resources) and not enough on output (measures such as student achievement) (Evers & Walberg, 2002; Stecher & Kirby, 2004).

Title I, Part A of NCLB provides extra funding to improve the quality of education for poor and minority children in order to provide them with the same opportunity as other children to meet challenging academic standards (GAO, 2002). These challenging academic standards, implemented by several states in the 1990s, "were set by these states unaware that substantial sanctions would eventually be associated with them if states failed to reach them" (Linn, 2002, p. 4).

Contending that too many children are being left behind in the schools and classrooms across America, the new Title I under NCLB makes far reaching demands that will shape practice in the nation's schools until 2009 (Cowan 2003, Jennings 2002). The increased rigor and far reaching demands of Title I, Part A embodies basic reform principles designed to hold classroom teachers, administrators, schools, local school districts and state educational agencies accountable (Stecher & Kirby, 2002, p. 2).

The reform principles of the legislation are standards-based accountability and the goals articulated are performance based (Sunderman & Kim, 2004, Executive Summary, 2002). Departing from previous revisions of the ESEA, NCLB is driven by:

1. Accountability for Results;
2. Emphasis on doing what works based on scientific research;
3. Parental choice; and,
4. Expanded local control (P.L. 107-110).

The legislation requires states to design their own accountability systems. Concluding that accountability systems have not been adequately researched and are still a relatively new science, Keegan and Orr (2002) advised forethought to states in the "defining, designing, and development of accountability systems" (p. 5).

Hanushek and Raymond (2003) state that the basic premise of accountability systems is geared to the academic performance of students. They continue to say, however, that appropriate accountability systems are not always obvious (p. 127).

NCLB and Accountability for Results

Title I of the reauthorized NCLB is similar to earlier versions of the legislation in that it provides a mechanism through which federal policy impacts education. The NCLB version of Title I differs from earlier reauthorizations in that accountability and assessment provisions are the heart of the legislation (Jennings, 2002). The key change in the new Title I centers on standards-based accountability (Cowan, 2004). Accountability is based on the implementation of the content standards and the performance of students on a test instrument aligned with those standards and other indicators. The standards must be the same for all schools in the state; however states are only required to apply the federal sanctions of NCLB to Title I schools and districts.

Eligibility for school wide Title I programs was lowered from 50% to 40% of the school's total enrollment of children from low-income families (P.L. 107-110). Formula grants under the new Title I funding granted states some flexibility in the allocations of these federal funds. However, states are required to target schools and school districts with the highest percentage of poor children (GAO, 2002). Most Title I funds are directed to elementary schools and are generally spent for instructions in reading and mathematics (Oklahoma State Department of Education, 2003).

Schools, local education agencies (LEAs), and State Departments of Education (SEAs) are held accountable for improving the academic achievement of all students. These agencies (schools, LEAs and SEAs) are also held responsible for turning around

low-performing schools that fail to provide a high-quality education to their students while providing alternatives to students in such schools to enable the students to receive a high-quality education (Cowan, 2003).

The revised legislation mandates high-quality academic assessments, high stakes accountability systems, teacher preparation and training curriculum, and instructional materials to be aligned with challenging state academic standards. Students, teachers, parents, and administrators can measure progress against common expectations for student academic achievement (Jennings, 2002).

Schools, LEAs, and SEAs are also held responsible for meeting the educational needs of low-achieving children in the nation's highest poverty schools, limited English proficient children, migratory children, children with disabilities, neglected or delinquent children, and young children in need of reading assistance, in addition to ensuring that the academic needs of students from major racial or ethnic groups are met. Closing the achievement gap between minority and non-minority students and between disadvantaged children and their more affluent counterparts are not optional and are demanded within a specified time period (Cowan, 2004, Jennings, 2002).

Assessment and Adequate Yearly Progress under NCLB

The NCLB significantly increases student assessment with measurable performance objectives that all students must meet. State assessments, a primary factor in a state's measurement of adequate yearly progress, are to be aligned with the state's academic achievement standards (Cowan, 2004).

AYP, first introduced in 1994, is the complicated accountability framework intended to ensure that states are making progress on their annual measurable objectives

(Cowan, 2004). All students must demonstrate proficiency in reading and English, as well as math and science. A change in AYP stipulates that it must be defined based on the percentage of students that must achieve a proficient score each year. As long as states are moving towards the 100% proficiency by 2013-2014, they may use an index where credit is given for moving the lowest performing students to a partial proficiency level (Cowan, 2004). One of the more challenging provisions in the determination of AYP is the requirement that at least 95% of the students in each subgroup (same groups as identified in IASA) must be assessed. In addition, the graduation rate for secondary school students and at least one other indicator for elementary public school students append the AYP formula. The other indicators include, but are not limited to, average daily membership (ADM) and the dropout rate.

Hamilton and Koretz (2002) state that "test-based accountability systems incorporate a set of policies and procedures that provides rewards and /or sanctions as a consequence of scores on large-scale achievement test" (p. 13). Moreover, test-based accountability aids in narrowing the gap by providing feedback to parents, students, and teacher, as well as other site and district personnel.

Annual academic assessments, considered a "vital diagnostic tool for schools to achieve continuous improvement" (Executive Summary, the White House, 2002) are to provide "a valid set of inferences related to particular expectations for students and schools" (Linn, 2002, p. 3).The state established academic achievement standards are to be measured annually in reading and math for grades 3-8, and at least once in grades 10-12. This expanded assessment is required of all students in public schools. In addition,

beginning no later than school year 2005-2006, science testing is to be implemented but not required annually.

In 2002-2003, states were required to begin annually assessing English proficiency for all English language learners. A limited language learner is defined in the legislation as a student with limited English proficiency (LEP) between the ages of 3-21 who is attending an elementary or secondary school and has difficulty in writing, understanding, reading or speaking the English language (ESEA, Title IX). More importantly, the inability of the student's language skills is determined to be sufficient enough to hinder their success on the state level assessment. Limited English students must also meet one of the following criteria:

1. Native language is not English or not born in the United States;
2. Native Americans, Alaska Native; or student comes from a limited English milieu which could impact the student's level of English proficiency; or,
3. Student is migratory and native language is not English (P.L. 107-110).

NCLB requires that English language learners "be assessed in a valid and reliable manner and provided reasonable accommodations on assessments administered to each student including, to the extent practicable, assessments in the language and in academic content areas until such students have achieved English language proficiency" (P.L. 107-110). However, students who have attended school in the United States for three or more consecutive years are required to take the reading and language arts assessment in English. Conversely, if students are extremely limited in English, school districts can make a determination (continue to assess in the language yielding the most accurate data

on what the student knows for a maximum of two additional years) on a case-by-case basis (P.L. 107-l10).

In 1975, students with disabilities were guaranteed rights to a "free and public appropriate education" (Education of all Handicapped Children Act, Public Law 94-142). These students were recognized as having the right to impartial educational opportunities. Goals: 2000 articulated that "all children can learn and achieve to high standards and must realize their potential if the United States is to prosper" (P.L. 103-227, sec 301[1]). The initiative, which further stated that "all students are entitled to participate in a broad and challenging curriculum and are to have access to resources sufficient to address other education needs" (P.L.103-227, sec 301; [1]), established the foundation for increased academic standards for students with disabilities (SWD). The standards-based reform legislation was implemented in 1994 (H-Report 103-65) for students with disabilities.

The reauthorized and revised PL 94-142, renamed the Individuals with Disabilities Act [IDEA] in 1990 and amended in 1997, required the inclusion of disabled students in statewide assessments. With the enactment of NCLB, students with disabilities, in addition to being administered statewide assessments, are to be held to the same academic achievement standards as non-disabled students. Triggering dissension, the federal statues, NCLB and IDEA, are mired in controversy (Cowan, 2004). Under IDEA, authority is granted to a team of individuals to decide on the plan of education (Individualized Education Plan [IEP]) for the disabled child. The IEP specifies the measurement instrument to be administered. Equally, NCLB mandates that the assessments administered to disabled children be aligned with the same state academic content standards as non-disabled children.

In an attempt to align the laws, Congress, in 2003, expounded on the inclusion of the nation's 6 million or more students with disabilities and testing. In effect, states are required to (1) provide reasonable adaptations and accommodations for students with disabilities; (2) develop an alternate assessment closely linked to state content standards if students are significantly cognitively impaired (based on the decision of the IEP team); (3) hold students to "grade level standards" for adequate yearly progress purposes. However, a 1% cap of students categorized as significantly cognitively disabled could be measured against alternate standards (P.L. 107-110). *Quality Counts 2004* reported that nation-wide, less than 12% of the students receiving special education services are significantly cognitively disabled (Education Week, 2004). The alternate assessment for special education students is based on alternate standards. The federal government placed numerous responsibilities on states to "safeguard against limiting educational opportunities for students with disabilities" (Cowan, 2004, p. 17).

Quality Counts 2004: "Count Me In: Special Education in an Era of Standards" documented that "parents and educators are torn between wanting to raise the expectations for students with disabilities and concerns about special education students being held to the same standards and assessment requirements as others their age and /or grade level"(Education Week, January 8, 2004). The study found that 8 in 10 teachers believe that students with disabilities should be held to standards but that they should not be held to the same academic standards required of general education students. While the academic performance gap between regular education and students with disabilities is immense (Education Week, January 7, 2004) many of the respondents in the study

inferred that students with disabilities could paint a distorted academic picture of the job that the school and teachers are doing.

Each state was to establish a starting point using data from the 2001-2002 school years. A school's progress would be measured against their starting point. Starting points varied for each subject assessed and for each grade span. For example, the starting point for the Wake County Public Schools' assessments in Raleigh, North Carolina, was 52.0% for reading and 54.9% for math. From 2002 to 2004, the starting point in Oklahoma for math, reading and language arts assessments was 648 and 622, respectively. The targets, for both subjects, will increase significantly beginning with the 2004-2005 school year (North Carolina Department of Public Instructions, 2001, Oklahoma State Department of Education, 2002).

A critical revision in the assessment component of NCLB is the disaggregation of data and the method of reporting. The assessment results must yield individual student scores, subgroup scores and itemized score analyses for accountability purposes. Kane, Staiger and Geppert (2002) argue that requiring schools with multiple subgroups to demonstrate annual proficiency on state assessments will harm minorities due to the subjective sanctions of NCLB. Some also contend that subgroup accountability places deprived schools with a sizeable diverse population at a greater risk of failing (Sunderman & Kim, 2004).

NCLB also requires biennial state participation in the National Assessment of Education Progress (NAEP) in reading and math for 4^{th} and 8^{th} grade students. This mechanism was put into place to ensure that states are implementing the content standards and to confirm state test result (P.L. 107-110).

Coupled with AYP are the mandated timelines, in which the fifty states, in effect, must demonstrate that the accountability system is on track to reaching 100% proficiency of all its students by 2014. The timeline must include the annual goals and intermediate goals that increase in equal increments over the timeline. The first increase must occur within two years, and subsequent increases must follow at least every three year. Schools can reach AYP by meeting their intermediate goals. A safe harbor provision is in place to allow schools not making AYP avoid being classified as failing if a subgroup decreases their percentage of non-proficient students by 10% and make progress on one additional indicator; with at least 95% of the students in the subgroup assessed (P.L. 107-110).

The consequences of schools and districts failing to make AYP are the most significant and unprecedented in the history of education reform. The sanctions, which are explicitly stated in the legislation, include:

1. If a school fails to make AYP for two consecutive years, they are identified as in need of improvement. Parents must be given the option to transfer, at the district's expense, their child to another school in the district (including public charter schools) that has not been identified for improvement.
2. If a school fails to make AYP after three consecutive years, the school must continue to offer public school choice as well as, permitting disadvantaged students the use of Title I funds to pay for supplemental services from a provider of their choice that has been approved by the state department of education. School districts must set aside 20% of their total Title I allocations to pay for supplemental services and transportation.

3. If a school fails to make AYP for four consecutive years, the district must take actions against the school as outlined in section 1116 of the legislation (P.L. 107-110). Purposely, corrective actions taken by the district must include at least one of the following: a) adjust the school calendar to extend the school year or the school day; b) drastically diminish the authority of site administrators; c) remove ineffective classroom teachers and replace them with more competent professionals; d) develop and implement research based curricular designed to ensure that the low performing students and the school will make AYP; e) employ experts not associated with the school to revise and oversee the implementation the school's plan of improvement; or d) reorganize the internal makeup of the school.
4. Finally, if a school fails to make AYP for five consecutive years, the school will be completely restructured with alternative governance imposed (P.L. 107-110).

These consequences went into effect immediately with the implementation of NCLB for those schools identified earlier under the IASA as in need of improvement. More than 6500 schools were identified as being in their first year of school improvement in 2001-2002, not including the 3000 or more schools previously labeled as in need of improvement under IASA. These schools, under the law, are already moving into their second phase of the sanctions for failing to meet AYP under NCLB (Keegan & Orr, 2002).

Evers and Walberg (2002) contend that after years of poor educational performance, schools must now demonstrate responsibility. In effect, schools must prove

that students are reaching academic proficiency. The performance-based accountability system that embodies NCLB is multileveled, including SEAs, LEAs, schools, teachers, administrators, paraprofessionals, and parents. According to Stecher and Kirby (2004), however, SEAs "have the least-active role in the improvement process assigning the responsibility for improvement to the LEA or the school" (p. 3). They further argue that this was one of the ambiguities in previous reauthorizations of ESEA (Stecher & Kirby, 2004, p. 3).

Until 2002, IASA was viewed as the most sweeping reform in public education. Sizer (2004) and others assert that the reauthorized version, NCLB, goes too far (Sizer, 2004). The implementation and provisions of AYP under NCLB may prove to be troublesome and problematic for state and local school districts (Linn, 2002). Some analyst view AYP as an "all or nothing" way of looking at schools. Barely missing the target with one group is the same as missing the target for all. Policymakers contend that the reform initiatives that comprise NCLB are not the only way to hold schools accountable (Finn, 2002; Kirst, 1990).

If a school makes AYP at any point, while it is in Title I school improvement, the school will not move to the next level of sanctions. If a failing school failed to make AYP at the conclusion of the fourth year, it would be required to provide supplemental educational services for the next school year. Title I schools must meet AYP for two consecutive years in order to exit Title I school improvement. At that time, the school is no longer subject to sanctions (H.R.107-334).

It is suggested by the National Conference of State Legislators that more than

70% or more of the schools across the nations will be identified as in need of improvement within the coming years (National Conference of State Legislator, 2003). Darling-Hammond (2004) reported in the article, *From "Separate to Equal" to "No Child Left Behind": The Collision of New Standards and Old Inequalities* that in 2003 "more than 25,000 of the nation's 90,000 plus schools did not make AYP" (Darling-Hammond, 2004, p. 5).

In 2002-2003, nearly 400 of Oklahoma's schools did not make AYP , with 51 identified as in need of improvement. In 2003-2004, Oklahoma identified 146 of the states 1,814 schools as in need of improvement. This 200% increase was expected to occur, according to the Oklahoma State Department of Education, due to the benchmarks raised under NCLB in order to comply with the federal timeline (Oklahoma State Department of Education, 2004). During the same year, Florida reported that " 87% of its school failed to make AYP representing all of its school districts" (Neil, 2004, p. 103).

NCLB and Highly Qualified Teachers

Existing studies corroborate that teacher effectiveness is essential to learning (Sanders, 1999, Sanders & Rivers, 1996). It is widely believed that the least qualified teachers contribute significantly to the poor academic performance of the most needy students in the United States (Singham, 2003).

According to Linda Darling Hammond (2000), "curriculum inequalities are exacerbated by black students' lack of access to qualified teachers" (p. 4). Numerous studies have identified the importance of teachers' credentials in determining students' academic achievement (Darling-Hammond, 2000; Geringer, 2003; Kaplan & Owings, 2003, Rotherham & Mead, 2003). International assessment reveals that America's

schools are among the most unequal in the industrialized world in terms of teacher quality (Haycock, 2002, Kashrus, 2001,).

In response to findings such as these, teacher quality moved to the forefront of education reform. The requirement for states to employ highly-qualified teachers, paraprofessionals, and principals were first introduced in the IASA, however, the government, careful not to usurp states' rights in establishing certification criteria for their employee, stopped short of defining a highly qualified teacher.

Title I, Subpart A of NCLB requires all states to develop plans with annual measurable objectives to ensure that all teachers teaching core academic subjects are "highly qualified" by the end of the 2005-2006 school year. Core subjects are defined as English, reading, mathematics, science, foreign languages, civics and government, economics, arts, history, and geography.

States and local education agencies must annually report their progress towards reaching this goal. In addition, the legislation requires districts to use at least 5% to 10% of their Title I, Subpart A funds to ensure that their teachers are highly qualified. The law requires that all teachers who are working in a program supported with Title I funds and who were hired after the first day of the 2002-2003 school year must be "highly qualified" immediately. All existing teachers, other than Title I, must meet the "highly qualified" provision by 2005-2006.

Darling-Hammond (2004) argues that the intent of the highly qualified provision in the law is to correct the continual problem of non-certified and incompetent teachers instructing students. However, Darling-Hammond elaborates further that despite the goal

of NCLB to only employ highly qualified teachers, the federal government does not provide states and districts the support needed for this to occur.

Rural schools make-up more than 40% of the nation's public schools (Reeves, 2003, p. 2). For these schools, the NCLB highly qualified mandate poses several obstacles, especially since many of the instructors in rural setting are multitasked to teach several subjects. Given the difficulty in attracting teachers certified in myriad subjects to rural locations, NCLB will worsen an already critical situation (Reeves, 2003). The elimination of emergency, provisional, and temporary license, in addition to not being permitted to teach ones minor, would shrink their teacher pool. Kashrus (2001) opines that for a consistently beleaguered teaching pool with declining student enrollment, attracting highly qualified teachers to rural school settings will be a challenge (Kashrus, 2001).

Paraprofessionals are also required to be highly qualified. In order to obtain this designation, paraprofessionals are required to have completed two years of postsecondary education or have completed at least two years of study at an institution of higher education or met a rigorous standard of quality which includes an assessment of skills in math, reading, and writing. Non-Title I existing paraprofessionals have four years to comply. The law requires that all Title I paraprofessionals hired after the date of the enactment of NCLB, January 8, 2002, to meet the requirements immediately (P.L.107-110). Principals must attest in writing that their schools are in compliance with the new requirements of paraprofessionals. Title II of NCLB , which is beyond the scope of this study, further elaborates on highly qualified teachers and teacher training preparation.

Key provisions of NCLB's education reform efforts include requirements linked to the 1994 Reading Excellence Act which implemented research-based reading programs. The amended version of the Reading Excellence Act, renamed Reading First under NCLB, outlines a comprehensive reading initiative that includes diagnostic reading assessment, along with new programs for reading instructions and training teachers. All of the reading programs must be anchored to reading research. Funding for Reading First will be based on the state's Title I allocations. States increasing their reading proficiency, beginning in 2004, will be awarded incentive grants. States, however, must award priority to those districts with the highest percentages of children reading below grade level in grades K-3 in addition to being a high poverty district (P.L. 107-110).

Migrant Education, a program devised under the IASA of 1994, was designed to meet the special needs of children of migratory workers. In order to provide adequate funding for children of migrants, the funding formula was revised to reflect the appropriation of funds based on the count of migrant students resident in each state plus counts of children served in summer programs (P.L.107-110).

Neglected and delinquent students who are served in state institutions, youth facilities, and locally managed institutions were addressed in NCLB. Specifically, the new legislation placed greater emphasis on the transition of these students to school districts and/or post secondary education (P.L. 107-110).

Funding and No Child Left Behind

The United States Supreme Court found in the *San Antonio Independent School District v. Rodriquez* (1973) case that public education was not a federal constitutional right. Since states were held responsible for public education, financing public education

was also inferred as being the responsibility of the states. As a result, states and local resources account for approximately 90% of public education funding (United States General Accounting Office, 2002).

Since *Rodriquez,* numerous court cases have documented funding inadequacies in public education i.e. *Edgewood Independent School District v. Kirby (*1989) and *Alabama Coalition for Equity, Inc. v. Hunt (1993.* Disparities in funding (rural to urban) are pervasive due to districts relying on the revenues from local property taxes As a result, small or rural school districts generally have fewer fiscal resources on hand to adequately support public education (Reeves, 2003).

Broad support was initially given to NCLB because of its promise to increase federal funding for education in exchange for accountability. However, "the gap between the promises NCLB makes and the funding it provides is even larger" (Karp, 2004, p. 63).

Falling $7.2 million short in 2003 and $9 million short in the 2004 proposed budget (Associated Press, February 24, 2003), NCLB has been harshly criticized as being underfunded (Mathis, 2003, Neas, 2003) and not in compliance with the initial funds authorized under the legislation (Peyser & Costrell, 2004). A study directed by the Education Trust has shown that gaps in educational funding "have real consequences for the quality of education that low-income children receive" (Education Trust Bulletin, 2001).

Marian Wright Edelman of the Children's Defense Fund whose registered trademark, "Leave No Child Behind" was paraphrased by the Bush Administration, contends that the federal government's current level of funding NCLB is $12 billion

dollars less than what was authorized by Congress (Children's Defense Fund, February 23, 2005). Secretary of Education, Rod Paige contends that the legislation is adequately funded and that states have been sitting on NCLB funds (Paige, 2004).

Neil (2004) says that by underfunding the mandates outlined in NCLB, the federal government "assumes that schools can overcome the educational consequences of poverty and racism" (Neil, 2004, p. 102). "The funds promised by the legislation are approximately $8 billion per year less than what Congress authorized (Neil, 2004, p. 102).

Mathis (2003), after examining the cost and benefits of NCLB in ten states, reported that:

> When these historic federal investments in education are scrutinized, the first- year increases to Title I compensatory funds amount to a mere 0.4% of total education spending. When the much touted "flexibility" procedures that NCLB gives to local districts are examined, they allow, at best, a local district to shift around about 4.3% of its already committed money. When the so-called adequate yearly progress provisions of the law are examined, independent reviewers, almost without exception, say the plans are unrealistic. (Mathis, Phi Delta Kappan, 2003)

Mathis further argues that the financial commitment needed in order to realize the goals of the legislation have not been met (Mathis, 2003).

In 2003, Title I granted $11.3 billion to over 12 million children in more than 90% of the school districts across the nations. Mathis concluded in his study that it would take an increase of 30% annually for states to meet the requirements of NCLB

(Mathis, 2003). Additionally, the required funds that states and districts must reserve for vouchers and busing under NCLB will usurp all of the flexible funds received for Title I programs, with a net gain of zero additional resources (North Carolina Department of Instructions, 2003).

Sunderman and Kim (2004) state that deficits have impacted states enormously. In 2003 alone, states faced a deficit of $58 billion dollars. In the study, "Federal and State Relationships Under No Child Left Behind," all of the contiguous states, along with Alaska and Hawaii, were facing severe budget shortfalls that forced them to make cuts in education. Consequently, these cuts will make it even more challenging for states to meet the mandates of NCLB. The study further found that as states begin to understand and implement fully the requirements specified in the legislation, evidence suggests that the cost to be in full compliance of NCLB will outweigh the funds received from the federal government (Sunderman & Kim, 2004).

This literature review of Title I of ESEA and the emerging beliefs embedded in the new Title I, Subpart A of NCLB provided the background to understand the purpose of this study. NCLB dictates provisions and standards that all states are to implement. Previous discussion documented the theoretical framework outlined in the legislation. The next section will discuss state education reform, specifically in Oklahoma, the location of the participants involved in the study.

Oklahoma Education Reform

The Great Society educational reform of the1960s, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA, Public Law 89-10), began the journey of Title I in Oklahoma. The goal was to improve the quality and educational opportunities in public schools

(Sizer, 2004). Believing that education would ameliorate the "cycle of poverty" (Johnson, 1964) and that schools could make a difference, Title I, the core of ESEA, "distributed funds to improve the education of poor children" (Ravitch, 1985, p. 158).

With the federal dollars under Title I flowing to Oklahoma and the other states to aid minorities and economically disadvantaged children, the Department of Health, Education and Welfare (HEW) struggled to define exactly what programs should be implemented, the exact purposes of Title I funds, and how the funds were to be spent. (Jennings, 2000). Ravitch (1985) believed that the individuals responsible for managing Title I were more concerned about the distribution of federal dollars instead of ensuring that the dollars were well used. After the report, *Title I of ESEA: Is It Helping Poor Children?* was released in 1970, HEW concluded that the financial resources provided to the states were additional dollars to be spent on supplementary services for disadvantaged children and were not to be used as general aid for public schools (McClure & Martin, 1969).

From the 1970s to the 1980s, debate persisted on the effectiveness of Title I and whether the legislation fulfilled its commitment to provide a quality education to economically disadvantaged children. While some policymakers concluded that Title I had been successful and had helped to increase the academic performance of disadvantaged and minority students, critics called the legislation ineffective because it failed to eliminate the academic gap between minority and non-minority students or between economically disadvantaged students and their more affluent counterparts (Grissmer, et al. 1994, Jennings, 2000; Ravitch, 1985).

Arguments outlining the failure of Title I resulted in major changes in ESEA (Grissmer, 1994, Jennings, 2000;). The impact of the most notable reform report *A Nation at Risk* (National Commission for Excellence in Education, 1983) along with the growing perception that American public schools were in a crisis spawned intensive reform movements across the fifty states (Bradley, 1993).

Governors from across the nation, including Oklahoma's Henry Bellmon, assembled in 1988 to establish national education goals for America's children to attain by the year 2000. The goals were a response to the harsh criticisms of Title I coupled with unclear education goals with no accountability. Title I laws (Hawkins-Stafford Act of 1988), enacted in 1988, required Oklahoma and the other 49 states to establish levels of educational achievement for underprivileged children (Jennings, 2000).

Emerging public criticism on the deficiencies of Oklahoma's schools led Governor Bellmon to create "Task Force 2000" to assess the state's public education system in 1989. According to *Education Update* (1990), in the late 1980s, Oklahoma ranked 30th in high school graduation; 48th in teacher salaries; 24th out of the 28 states that used the ACT; 27th in population; 23rd in teacher pupil ratio and 46th in public school funding per average daily attendance (Oklahoma House Education Commission, 1990).

Oklahoma Educational Reform Act of 1990

In 1990, based on the recommendations of "Task Force 2000," Oklahoma's landmark education initiative, The Education Reform Tax Act, more commonly known as H.B. 1017 was enacted. (Firestone, Roenblaum, Bader, & Massell, 1991). H.B. 1017 pushed Oklahoma into the limelight by being one of the first states to implement a system of accountability which aligned state mandated standards with state assessments (Garrett,

1999). This sweeping reform laid the foundation for new curriculum standards, assessments (criterion-referenced tests), and accountability for schools, students, and teachers' preparation (Oklahoma State Department of Education) with a $230 million dollar increase in income, gasoline and sales taxes (*Shawnee News Star*, 1999).

Priority Academic Student Skills (PASS), the state academic and assessment standards enacted under H.B.1017, established curriculum standards and benchmarks to be attained by Oklahoma students beginning in 1993-1994 (Oklahoma State Department of Education). Specific reforms under H.B. 1017 included more academic rigor by placing an emphasis on core courses and aligning high school graduation with competency-based state criterion referenced tests; rigid school accreditation standards; increased emphasis on parental involvement; reduced class sizes; extended school year option for school districts; technology; and programs designed for at-risk four-year olds (H.B. 1017). Bess Keller (1993) of *Education Week* stated that as a result of this legislation, Oklahoma began to make some progress, but concluded, "the state still had a long way to go" (*Education Week*, 1993).

According to the Oklahoma Office of Accountability (2000), much of H.B. 1017 was designed to ensure that all students were performing at grade level (i.e. required minimum competencies) and that no student would be left behind (Office of Accountability, 2000). The Oklahoma School Testing Program was enacted in 1989 with the passing of Senate Bill 183, which required norm-referenced testing of students in grades 3,5,7,9 and 11. Later amended in 1994, the legislation outlined the norm-referenced test to be administered to students in grades 3 and 7 and established the Oklahoma Core Curriculum Test, a criterion –referenced test (CRT), to test a student's

competency in specific subjects as specified in PASS in grades 5, 8 and 11. Elementary and secondary students were required to perform at a satisfactory level demonstrating that they had mastered the academic skills in those subject areas. Students on Individualized Education Plans (IEP) and students with limited English proficiency (LEP) had traditionally been exempt from state assessments. Pursuant to IASA, the testing of all students was implemented in 1998 including those students that had previously been exempted. Performance on the assessments was gathered and disaggregated by 1) Regular Education, 2) Alternative Education, and 3) Special Education subgroups (Oklahoma State Department of Education Office of Accountability, 2000).

With an academic performance benchmark of 70% established by the Oklahoma Oversight Board, the Oklahoma State Department of Education reported the statewide results of student performance on the CRTs as encouraging. In May of 1991, school superintendents from across the state of Oklahoma reported progress in their districts as a result of H.B. 1017. However, Oklahoma state officials conceded that student academic performance varied significantly from school to school across the state prompting concerns about the state's education system K-12 (Office of Accountability, 2000).

Quality Counts 2000 (*Education Week*, 2000) ranked Oklahoma's fourth grade reading as 12th amid the fifty states based on student performance on the National Assessment of Education Progress (NAEP). Of the results reported, 30% of Oklahoma's fourth graders performed at or above the proficient level on the NAEP. The state's eight grade students posted scores of 29% and 25% respectively on the reading and writing assessments. John E. Stone and others of the Oklahoma Council of Public Affairs hypothesize that at the state's present ratio of students attaining proficiency that it will

take Oklahoma students anywhere from 13 to 20 years to progress to a satisfactory level (Oklahoma Council of Public Affairs, 2004).

Reforms Related to Oklahoma Education Reform

Goals 2000: The Educate America Act provided federal aid to Oklahoma and the other states to develop their own academic standards, define levels of mastery, and to initiate testing to determine whether students had reached academic levels of mastery. A timeline was established as each State Department of Education was to assure the U.S. Department of Education that the eight components outlined in Goals 2000 would be accomplished by the year 2000 (Campbell, 2003; Goals, 2000).

The objectives of *Goals 2000* were extended into the 1994 revision of the ESEA, IASA. IASA, which complemented Goals 2000, was overhauled to support states in setting standards for all children, improving teaching and learning, and to provide flexibility to stimulate school-based and district initiatives. Additionally IASA focused on accountability and created links among schools, parents, and communities to target resources where the needs were the greatest.

IASA conveyed that states, including Oklahoma, would now be held responsible for imposing rigorous academic content standards that all students were to master. Title I students were not to be denied a quality education and were to be taught the same academic content standards as non-Title I students (Improving America's Schools Act, 1994).

Assessments were legislated to determine if students mastered the content standards within specific subjects (math, reading and language arts). In order for the assessment to be valid, the measurement had to be aligned with the state content

standards. All students were to be administered the assessment except students new to the school and specific special education categories which would be administered an alternative assessment. All schools were expected to make AYP.

Scores were disaggregated by ethnicity, gender, socioeconomic and migrant status, limited English proficiency (LEP), and disabilities. LEP students were to be assessed, "to the extent practicable" (Improving America's Schools Act, 1994).These scores were then reported to parents in the form of a report card. If a school failed to make AYP and was identified as a school in need of improvement, parents were provided options. Schools that consistently failed to make AYP (four consecutive years or more) faced corrective actions. Only Title I schools and districts receiving Title I funds could be classified or put on an improvement plan. Title I allocations provided almost $7 billion to schools across the country.

Although Oklahoma's H.B.1017 implemented standards-based reform aligned with testing in 1990, IASA forced states to designed or revamp their policies on accountability systems if they were to continue receiving Title I aid. States were issued deadlines to submit their plans and evidence validating that they were in compliance with Title I of the ESEA. Oklahoma met the October 1, 2000 deadline, but only three states (Pennsylvania, Louisiana, and Wyoming) were found to be in full compliance (Zehr, 2000). Cohen (2000) stated that the requirements under IASA were complex and anticipated "that most states would receive conditional approval with the understanding that they will make some adjustments later in the year" (p. 8).

In 1998, The United States General Accounting Office (GAO) reported that under the Education Flexibility Partnership Demonstration Act (Ed-Flex) of 1994, selected

states were authorized to grant temporary exemptions to their local schools from federal requirements under Title I. The decision to grant waivers to states was determined by the U.S. Department of Education as a part of the application process. Several states did not apply for the authority to grant waivers to their school districts (GAO, B-281282, 1998).

Critics and some supporters of the federal government debated granting waivers to states, while others argued that, IASA had not boosted the achievement of poor children. Consequently, rhetoric increased calling for an overhaul of the reauthorized ESEA (Rees, 1998).

NCLB, described as "a nightmare of regulations in pursuit of good intentions" (Michigan Association of School Boards, 2003), was enacted on January 8, 2002. As previously discussed, the legislation takes a hard stance on the inadequacies of public education. It seeks to change American education with demands of accountability and a focus on what works (Executive Summary, The White House, 2002).

The complex law and its regulations affects both Title I and non-Title I schools. To assure that no child will be left behind, each state, including Oklahoma, along with their LEAs and schools are held responsible "for the strict requirements of academic progress for every learner" regardless of their background or ability (*Journal of the Michigan Association of School Boards*, 2003).

For the federal government to make that assurance, accountability with consequences was the centerpiece of the legislation. The comprehensive legislation says that schools will meet the goal of 100% proficiency for all students (regardless of race, ethnicity, limited English, income or disability in language arts, mathematics, and science (to be tested in 2007-2008) by 2013-2014.

Since the reauthorization of NCLB in 2002, states were to implement and submit their accountability plan to the U.S. Department of Education by January 31, 2003. Each state's NCLB accountability plan outlined the status of the required elements established under the legislation. The State Accountability System Element (U.S. Department of Education, P.L. 107-110) specifies that the:

1. Accountability system includes all schools and districts.
2. Accountability system holds all schools to the same criteria.
3. Accountability system incorporates the academic achievement standards.
4. Accountability system includes report cards.
5. Accountability system includes rewards and sanctions.
6. Accountability system includes all students.
7. Accountability system has a consistent definition of full academic year.
8. Accountability system properly includes mobile students.
9. Accountability system expects all student subgroups, public schools, and LEAs to reach proficiency by 2013-2014.
10. Accountability system has a method for determining whether student subgroups, public school, and LEAs made AYP.
11. Accountability system establishes a starting point.
12. Accountability system establishes statewide annual measurable objectives.
13. Accountability system establishes intermediate goals.
14. Accountability system includes all the required student subgroups.
15. Accountability system holds schools and LEAs accountable for the progress of student subgroups.

16. Accountability system includes students with disabilities.
17. Accountability system includes limited English proficient students.
18. The state has determined the minimum number of students sufficient to yield statistically reliable information for each purpose for which disaggregated data is used.
19. The state has strategies to protect the privacy of individual students in reporting achievement results.
20. Accountability system is based primarily on academic assessments.
21. Accountability system includes graduation rate for high schools.
22. Accountability system includes an additional academic indicator for elementary and middle /junior high schools.
23. Accountability indicators are reliable and valid.
24. Accountability system holds students, schools, and districts separately accountable for reading and language arts, and mathematics.
25. Accountability system produces reliable decisions.
26. Accountability systems produce valid decisions.
27. State has a plan for addressing changes in assessment and student population.
28. Accountability system has a means for calculating the rate of participation in the statewide assessment and
29. Accountability system has a means for applying the 95% assessment criteria to student subgroups and small schools.

Each state's accountability plan provided the U.S. Department of Education with its status (final, proposed awaiting state approval and working to formulate policy) in

meeting the requirements of NCLB (U.S. Department of Education, Public Law 107-110).

Oklahoma's Accountability Plan was approved by the United States Department of Education on May 30, 2003. The status of the state's proposed plan met all of the required elements except policies reflecting a consistent definition of a full academic year, rewards and sanctions, and the determination of the minimum number of students sufficient to yield statistically reliable information for each purpose for which disaggregated data is used (Oklahoma NCLB Accountability Plan, 2003).

Oklahoma's accountability system incorporated a statewide scoring system called Academic Performance Index (API). Schools and school districts' percentage scores, based primarily upon state-mandated tests and student achievement targets, were converted into an API numeric score ranging from 0-1500 (Title 70 O.S Supp. 2000, Section. 3-150, Section 3-151). Additional indicators, including attendance, drop-out rates, average ACT scores, graduation, college remediation and participation, and performance on advanced placements courses (AP) were factored into a school or district's performance index. Under NCLB, AYP is incorporated into the state's API accountability system (Oklahoma State Department of Education, 2004).

The submission of accountability plans to the U.S. Department of Education is not to imply that states are fully implementing or are in compliance with NCLB. The U.S. Department of Education conceded that some of the critical components of a state's plan may not have been finalized by the due date (Hickok, U.S .Department of Education, 2003).

In a survey conducted by the Education Commission of the States (ECS) which examined the progress of states in attaining the requirement of NCLB, results were mixed (Sanders, 2003). While the evidence suggested that a majority of the states might be on track in meeting some of the requirements, they appeared to be partially on track or not on track in meeting some of the other mandates of the law (Sanders, 2003). ECS concluded that "the onus is on state and federal government to provide practical guidance" to schools and districts (Sanders, 2003, p. 28). Jennings (2003) stated that schools and districts are beginning to feel the impact of the legislation. He further revealed that in order for schools and school districts to meet with success in meeting the mandates of NCLB those schools will need increased funding from the federal government, functional instructional strategies for under performing students and expert professional growth for teachers (Jennings, 2003).

With states and LEAs struggling to implement and be in compliance with NCLB (Michigan Association of School Boards, 2003), the National Education Association (NEA) has criticizes the law as being under funded, not representing schools or district in a fair and reliable manner and opposes the legislation's strong conviction to high-stakes assessments (National Education Association, 2003). Arguing that NCLB does not provide the necessary funds as specified in the legislation to fully fund the Act, NEA has threaten to sue (Hardy, 2003).

Notwithstanding legal actions challenging requirements in NCLB, states and LEAs are working to implement the Act (Jennings, 2003). In as much as the answerability to NCLB are most stringent at the local level, some schools and school districts have been actively engaged in educating their faculty and staff about the Act

(Jennings, 2003). A recent Gallup poll, assisted by Phi Delta Kappa, found that 36% to 40% of respondents knew little or nothing about NCLB. Another 69% of the participants were reported as not being able to respond favorable or unfavorable to the Act due to their lack of knowledge (Jennings, 2003).

The explicit requirements of NCLB place extensive accountability upon public schools. These requirements "are not universally understood by those who will have to implement them" (Hardy, 2003). With building level administrators and teachers being held accountable for the implementation of the mandates of NCLB, the purpose of this study is to examine educators' understanding of NCLB and their perceived implications of the legislation.

Oklahoma, to some extent a rural state with several large suburban and urban public school communities (SCIMAST, 2002) is the state where the participants in the study are employed. As a result, further details regarding Oklahoma's public schools and its accountability system are found in Chapter III.

Summary

This chapter was divided into five main sections which provided a review of the literature related to the history of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA). Special focus was on the recently reauthorized ESEA, renamed the No Child Left Behind Act of 2002, Title I, Subpart A. Chapter III provides further details of Oklahoma's accountability system and the methodology used to answer the research questions.

CHAPTER THREE

Research Design

Introduction

The primary purpose of this study was to examine educators' professed understanding and their perceived implications of The No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB), Title I, Subpart A, a reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) of 1965. The researcher discovered no previous research about the 2001 legislation related to educators understanding and perceived implications. Since educators are the principal individuals held responsible for the implementation of the legislation and meeting its requirements, determining whether they have an understanding of the legislation and their discernment of the concomitant implications is critical. The original ESEA enacted in 1965, along with reauthorizations of the legislations from 1970 to 1994, contributed to the body of knowledge examined in this study.

This chapter is divided into nine sections. The first section reviews the purpose of the study and the questions to be addressed. The second section is a discussion of the state education reform of Oklahoma, the setting for the study. Following this discussion, section three provides a general description of the design of the study. The fourth section presents the participants in the study. The fifth section outlines the methods and procedures used in the collection of data. The pilot study and the results of the pilot study are presented in sections six and seven. Following the results of the pilot study, section eight discusses the methods used to address the research questions. The final section provides a summary of the chapter.

Research Questions

This study is guided by the research questions below:

1. To what extent do classroom teachers profess to understand the provisions of Title I of the No Child Left Behind Act?
2. To what extent do principals profess to understand the provisions of Title I of the No Child Left Behind Act?
3. Are there statistically significant differences in the extent of understanding provisions of Title I of the No Child Left Behind Act between principals and classroom teachers?
4. Are there statistically significant differences between educators in Title I schools and in non-Title I schools in their understanding of the Title I provisions of NCLB?
5. What do classroom teachers believe to be the implications of the No Child Left Behind Act?
6. What do principals believe to be the implications of the No Child Left Behind?
7. Are there statistically significant differences between classroom teachers and principals regarding the implications of the No Child Left Behind Act?
8. Are there statistically significant differences between educators in Title I and non-Title I schools regarding the implications of No Child Left Behind?

The Research Setting

Oklahoma educators were selected to participate in this study. Their selection was based on the availability of a database of classroom teachers and principals representing public schools from varied environments. Another factor contributing to the decision to use Oklahoma educators in the study was cost. As a result, it is critical to understand the context of Oklahoma education reform in order to value the results of the study.

The onus of the implementation of NCLB is primarily placed on the shoulders of classroom teachers and site administrators (Moe, 2003). Diane Ravitch (1985) contends that "historically American education reform has been characterized by teachers bearing the burden of one educational reform after another" (p. 19). Albeit NCLB relies upon high stakes testing and accountability as the conduit to meet its requirements, the implications for classroom teachers and site administrators are enormous (Linn, 2002).

Described as a daunting task (Hardy, 2003; Moe, 2003), educators are required to increase student achievement of all students to 100% proficiency in reading/language arts and math by 2013-2014, close the achievement gap between the major student subgroups including students with disabilities and English language learners and employ scientifically based research methodologies, to cite a few. Additionally, classroom teachers teaching in core academic subjects are required to be "highly qualified" by the end of the 2005-2006 school year. All newly hired teachers employed in Title I schools must be "highly qualified" (P.L. 107-110).

According to the National Education Association (NEA, 2003), some states and school districts are struggling to implement and be in compliance with the new legislation forcing some to legally challenge tenets of the legislation. NEA threatened legal action

challenging the inadequacy of federal funds to meet the requirements of the law, which would shift the burden of financing the mandates upon the states (NEA, 2003a). The California court, in January of 2003, involving teacher support groups challenged the state definition of what constitutes a highly qualified teacher. The states of Pennsylvania, Vermont, Hawaii, Arizona and New Mexico, to name a few, have disputed the fairness of the sanctions mandated under NCLB with some passing legislation to opt out of NCLB (Pennsylvania School Boards Association, 2004).

NCLB imposes consequential mandates upon American public education. State Departments of Education, Local Education Agencies, schools, site administrators, and classroom teachers are held accountable (P.L. 107-110). Consequently, it is critical for these public school practitioners to have knowledge of the legislation as well as its implications. This study will examine the professed understanding and implications of NCLB as perceived by educators presently employed in public schools in Oklahoma.

To summarize the setting of the study, the rationale for selecting Oklahoma was based on several factors: First, Oklahoma was one of the first five states (along with Connecticut, Kentucky, New York and Pennsylvania) to have partially met the requirements of No Child Left Behind (USA Today, 2004). Oklahoma's Accountability Plan was approved in May, 2003. However, an early analysis of Oklahoma's plan indicated that six out of the 40 requirements mandated by the United States Department of Education (USDOE) were pending final approval. The six requirements partially met by the state included Technical Assistance; State Report Card; Definition for Highly Qualified Teacher; Subject Matter Competence; Highly Qualified Teacher in Every Classroom and High Quality Professional Development. Second, Oklahoma, with its 541

school districts represents an ethnic composition of 18.49% American Indian/Alaskan; 10.91 % African American; 7.64 % Hispanic; and 61.46 % White and other of its 622,845 students. Additionally, over 80,000 of the student population (average daily enrollment) are enrolled in Special Education K-12; and 54% of Oklahoma's students qualify for free and reduced-priced lunches. According to *Oklahoma Kids Count Factbook* (2003), Oklahoma ranks 41st in the nation for child poverty. Third, it was reported in 2003 that 1,183 of Oklahoma's 1,801 public schools received Title I funds (Oklahoma State Department of Education, 2003). In effect, more than sixty-five percent of the state's public schools receive millions of dollars from the federal government to assist disadvantaged children in school wide or targeted assistance Title I programs. Fourth, with more than forty percent of Oklahoma's public schools in rural locations (Southwest Educational Development Laboratory, 2002), the state employed in excess of 40,000 educators during school year 2002-2003. As required by NCLB, all public school teachers in early childhood education and middle school or secondary school core academic subjects must be highly qualified by the end of the 2005-2006 school year (P.L. 107-110).

Prior to IASA and NCLB, Oklahoma enacted legislation requiring all new educators to demonstrate competency on rigorous subject matter assessments. As a result of NCLB, however, every school district (rural, urban, suburban, etc.) in the nation must now provide documentation verifying that all of their educators are highly qualified. Veteran teachers (teachers certified to teach in their subject areas prior to the implementation of mandatory subject matter testing) are able to demonstrate that they are highly qualified through the High Objective Uniform State Standards of Evaluation

(HOUSSE). This evaluation system consists of a numerical summative checklist. In 2004, it was reported by the Oklahoma State Department of Education that 98% of Oklahoma's classroom teachers were "highly qualified."

Subsequently, the characteristics of the state of Oklahoma mirror the nation with its rising number of schools and school districts failing to make adequate yearly progress (AYP). In 2003-2004, schools failing to make AYP more than doubled from the previous year in the state as it did nationwide (Oklahoma Education Association, 2004).

Each state, including Oklahoma, was provided some autonomy in designing its accountability and statewide assessment strategy. According to NCLB, all students are to be administered annual assessments in reading and language arts, as well as math (science beginning in 2006-2007). Moreover, their performance scores on the annual assessment are to be disaggregated with every subgroup counted separately in the AYP calculation. The student subgroups calculated for AYP in Oklahoma are:

1) All students;
2) Regular Education Students (this does not include students with disabilities who are on Individualized Education Programs, or who are English Language Learners).
3) Students with Individualized Education Programs (IEP);
4) English Language Learners;
5) Economically Disadvantaged Students;
6) American Indian Students;
7) Asian/Pacific Islander Students;
8) Black Students;

9) Hispanic Students;

10) White Students; and

11) Other Students (this category includes those students that have not been identified in one of the five major racial/ethnic groups).

While migrant status and gender are subgroups to be included in assessment disaggregation, they are not considered in the calculating of AYP (P.L. 107-110).

Schools were given twelve years from the year of the reauthorization of ESEA (2002) for each subgroup to demonstrate 100% proficiency. All school districts and schools are to demonstrate AYP towards meeting the mandated timeline; however, schools receiving Title I funds face the federal penalties outlined in the legislation (P.L. 107-110).

Oklahoma's statewide accountability plan is based on the state's required academic content and achievement standards, Priority Academic Student Skills (PASS) and its annual determination of AYP is the Academic Performance Index (API). The state's plan includes baseline data and sets minimal growth targets towards 100% proficiency by 2013-2014. The required 95% or more of each subgroup are assessed and scores are disaggregated and reported on the state, district and site report cards (Oklahoma State Department of Education). Oklahoma's API Plan (Title 70 O.S. 3-150 and 3-151) consists of seven indicators that are factored into the API formula. The API education indicators are:

1. Oklahoma School Testing Program (OSTP);
2. Attendance rates;
3. Dropout rates;

4. Advanced Placement participation and performance;
5. Graduation rates;
6. ACT average scores;
7. College remediation rates;

The API indicators calculated for AYP are:

1. Reading and Language Arts Assessment;
2. Math Assessment;
3. 95% of (each subgroup) Student Participation in State Testing; and
4. Student Attendance and Graduation Rate.

In the calculation of AYP for validity and reliability the size of "n" is critical. With states varying in their determination of "n," some have employed a small "n" while others have selected a large "n." Oklahoma has employed an "n" of 30 for all students and regular students and an "n" of 52 for each major subgroup in the disaggregation of data on math, reading and language arts assessments to calculate AYP. The API statewide timeline performance targets for 2002-2003, moving towards the goal of 100% proficiency by 2013-2014 were 648 in math and 622 in reading. In the coming years, performance targets in math and reading will be augmented every two years initially and then every three years.

The Oklahoma State Board of Education's report, identifying schools not meeting the mandates of NCLB, more than doubled since 2003. Nationally, 6,794 schools failed to make AYP in 2004. In contrast, 3,605 schools were reported as not making AYP in 2003 (Oklahoma Education Association, 2004).

Consequently, the schools and districts in Oklahoma failing to make AYP for two consecutive years have been identified as in need of improvement. Nationwide, 28,000 of the estimated 90,000 schools have been identified as likely sites to be labeled in need of improvement (Karp, 2003). Eventually, it is projected that 75% of all public schools will be identified (Karp, 2003).

Given the breadth of NCLB and the mandates levied upon schools across the nation, this study seeks to examine educators' professed understanding and their perceived implications of the legislation. The respondents selected for the study will represent Oklahoma public school educators representing grade levels K-12.

Design of Study

A quasi-experimental quantitative design was selected for its value in "drawing inferences about a large group of people from data available from only a representative subset of the group" (Shavelson, 1996, p. 8). Specifically, descriptive and inferential statistics were used in the study to describe and interpret the outcome (Shavelson, 1996). According to Shavelson (1996), " …descriptive statistics will provide a picture of what happened in the study through the concepts and methods used in organizing, summarizing, tabulating, depicting and describing collections of data" (p. 8).

Inferential statistics were used to draw inferences from the educators in order to reflect the understanding and implications of NCLB as perceived by educators across the state. Quantitative data, such as scores on instruments, yield specific numbers that can be statistically analyzed and can produce results to assess frequency (Crewell, 2002). Specifically, the independent study t-test design was used to measure the means between the groups in the study. The theoretical model of the t-test is called the " *sampling*

distribution of t for differences between independent means" (Shavelson, p. 345). The survey instrument was used to measure the dependent variable in this research study.

Research Participants

The target population for this study consisted of currently employed certified classroom teachers and building level administrators employed in public schools, grades K-12 from across the state of Oklahoma. Educators selected to participate in the study represented public classroom teachers and administrators employed at elementary and secondary schools located in rural, urban, and suburban settings across the state of Oklahoma. The public school sites were classified as either Title I or non-Title I.

Sampling

Random sampling techniques (Gall, Borg, & Gall, 1996) were used in the selection of participants who are affiliated with the Oklahoma Achievement Through Collaboration and Technology (OK-ACTS). The OK-ACTS database provided a broad list of educators employed in schools from across the state. The list was divided into two groups, classroom teachers and site administrators. For the purpose of this study superintendents and central office personnel identified on the OK-ACTS list were eliminated and not included. Once a database of classroom teachers and site administrators were compiled from the OK-ACTS list, every third name on each of the list (principals and teachers) were randomly selected to participate in the study.

Participants

The subjects varied in their role as educators. Despite variations, classroom teachers shared two common characteristics, 1) they had a minimum of two years of teaching experience, and 2) they were certified to teach in the state of Oklahoma. Site

level administrators, despite variations, shared two common characteristics, 1) they had a minimum of two years of administrative experience, and 2) they were certified as school administrators in the state of Oklahoma.

Methods and Procedures

The 2003-2004 OK-ACTS' broad list of educators, provided by the University of Oklahoma, was used to select classroom teachers and site administrators to participate in the study. A cover letter, two consent forms and a self-addressed stamped envelope were mailed to every third name on each list of classroom teachers and site administrators.

The cover letter provided the following information:

1) The background of the researcher.
2) Purpose and significance of the study.
3) Assurance of Confidentiality.
4) A deadline to respond to the survey on line (or if a hardcopy was requested, a deadline for return of the survey).

The researcher's guarantee to the respondents of complete confidentiality was indicated in the cover letter.

The informed consent form was either mailed back to the researcher in the stamped, self-addressed envelope or submitted electronically. The consent form provided the respondents with the web address containing the survey instrument. The electronic survey was password protected with files tracked and deleted at the completion of the study. The respondents were provided the option of requesting a hard copy of the survey. The directions for obtaining a hardcopy of the survey were outlined in the informed consent form.

Data Source and Development of the Instrument

The Comprehensive No Child Left Behind Reform Questionnaire (CNCLRQ), a 47 item instrument that surveyed educators' professed understanding and perceived implications, was developed from (a) the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (P.L. 107-110, (b) The New Title I: The Changing Landscape of Accountability (Cowan, 2003), (c) Jennings' (2003) research on the effects and implementation of the No Child Left Behind Act, and (d) Rea and Parker's (1997) guide on designing and conducting meaningful survey research. The original instrument was divided into four sections, (a) Professional Background, (b) Understanding of the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001, (c) Instructional Implications of the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001, and (d) Funding Implications of the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (Appendix A).

Section one, which consisted of screening the respondents' professional background, included the following:

1) Position held.
2) Total years in current teaching position.
3) Total years in current principal's position
4) Grade levels served.
5) Classification of School.
6) Plan of Improvement Status.

Section two examined educators' professed understanding of Title I, Subpart A of NCLB. The items in this section were drawn from the legislation.

Section three examined instructional implications of Title I, Subpart A of NCLB as perceived by educators. The items in this section were guided by the literature review and NCLB.

Section four examined the financial implications of the legislation as perceived by educators. This section was guided by the literature review and NCLB.

In sections two through four of the survey instrument, the respondents were instructed to provide their level of agreement with each statement. This study used a likert- type scale "allowing respondents to select their level of agreement" (Gall, Borg, & Gall, 1996, p. 273). Specifically, a four point likert-type scale with letter (s) representing the evaluative terms: A= Agree, SA=Strongly Agree, D=Disagree, SD=Strongly Disagree were used in this study.

Preliminary Data

The preliminary survey questionnaire was developed and distributed to an expert panel to help validate the instrument. Each of the experts was instructed to carefully scrutinize the preliminary questionnaire and to determine if the instrument will provide the necessary data to answer the research questions.

Researcher bias was controlled through the sampling of individuals knowledgeable about NCLB from (a) the Oklahoma State Department of Education, (b) central office administrators, (c) school building level administrators, (d) classroom teachers, and (e) college instructors. Each of the prospective participants was personally contacted.

Once the individuals agreed to be a member of the expert panel, information was provided to each of them. The information provided included a cover letter for the expert

panel, the preliminary survey questionnaire to be examined, an exact copy of the cover letter to accompany the survey questionnaire to the participants, and a self-addressed stamped envelope to allow the panel members to return their responses.

The cover letter to the expert panel members: (a) introduced and discussed the significance of the study, (b) outlined the guidelines to follow in the validating of the survey instrument, (c) assured the participants of anonymity, and (d) thanked the panel members for their participation. Expert panel members participating in the validating of the survey instrument were not provided the identity of the other panel participants.

The expert panel's purpose was to examine the content of the survey questionnaire to determine its validity in addition to examining the construct of the instrument in order to determine if the questionnaire rendered the data to answer the research questions in the study. The expert panel member was also expected to recommend changes to the survey instrument, if appropriate.

Pilot Study

A pilot study was conducted to examine the clarity and reliability of the survey instrument. Jaeger (1984) states that "it is critical for subjects in a study to understand the directions and each item in the survey instrument" (p.13). According to Borg and Gall (1996), a pilot study of a survey instrument is conducted to ensure that the understanding of the questions by the respondents is in line with the instrument's intended interpretation (Gall, Borg, & Gall, 1996).

The anonymous pilot study survey was mailed with instructions along with self-stamped addressed return envelopes to eighty building level administrators and classroom teachers selected randomly from the OK-ACTS database located at the University of

Oklahoma. The participants selected for the pilot study were mailed exact copies of the cover letter, informed consent form and the questionnaire. The participants in the pilot study were given total freedom to recommend corrections, deletions, revisions and modifications of survey questions that appeared to be problematic.

An item analysis of the questionnaire was checked for internal consistency through Cronbach's alpha. The responses of the participants selected for the pilot study were not included in the main study.

Pilot Study Results

The CNCLBRQ instrument was used to generate the data utilized in the analysis. The researcher developed the instrument. The instrument included five professional background questions, 14 items intended to ascertain the professed understanding of NCLB by teachers and principals, and 29 items intended to ascertain the perceived implications of NCLB by these educators. The questionnaire was content validated by an expert panel, including a Title I specialist from the Oklahoma State Department of Education, a public school district Title I coordinator, and a district assistant superintendent of curriculum and instructions.

The instrument was administered to 80 subjects for purposes of content validation and reliability analysis. Subjects were asked to provide feedback for content validation to improve the items. The response rate to the pilot questionnaire was 66%, with 53 of the 80 questionnaires returned. Nine of the fifty-three respondents failed to answer the survey questions, but they provided extensive comments about the survey and recommendations for future studies (included in chapter five).

Respondents were asked to rate their level of agreement with each item using a 4-point likert-type scale. The ratings were "SD" for Strongly Disagree, "D" for Disagree, "A" for Agree and "SA" for Strongly Agree. These agreement ratings were numerically coded to facilitate data entry using Microsoft Excel and SPSS. Strongly Disagree was coded "1," Disagree was coded "2," Agree was coded "3," and Strongly Agree was coded "4."

Cronbach's alpha, a coefficient of reliability, was used to determine the internal consistency of the instrument. According to most Social Scientists, an alpha coefficient of reliability of .80 or higher is acceptable (Academic Testing Services, February, 2005). The CNCLBRQ was originally clustered into four sections. The first of these was professional background, an area not analyzed for reliability. Section Two, entitled, Understanding of the No Child Left Behind Act of 200, resulted in an alpha of .91 demonstrating substantial internal consistency. The other two sections of the instrument (Section Three, Instructional Implications and Section Four, Funding Implications of NCLB) were collapsed into one section based on the calculation of the section alphas. A revised section, entitled Section Three, Perceived Implications of NCLB, consisted of 21 items that were included in the final instrument (Appendix B). An alpha of .81 was calculated for the revised implication section. The preliminary and final results of the reliability analysis are included in the appendix (Appendix C).

As a result of these findings, the original forty-eight question instrument was adapted for use with the main study. The elimination of the inconsistent items resulted in 35 items, not including the five professional background questions, in the final instrument.

Analysis

The study addressed the following research questions:

Research Question One: "To what extent do classroom teachers profess to understand the provisions of Title I of the No Child Left Behind Act?" Descriptive statistics for each item included Section Two of the NCLB (items 1-14) were used to address this question. Included were the means, standard deviations, and response frequencies of the teacher respondents.

Research Question Two: "To what extent do principals profess to understand the provisions of Title I of the No Child Left Behind Act?" Descriptive statistics for each item included Section Two of the NCLB (items 1-14) were used to address this question. Included were the means, standard deviations, and response frequencies of the principal respondents.

Research Question Three: "Are there statistically significant differences in the extent of understanding provisions of Title I of the No Child Left Behind Act between principals and classroom teachers?" The question was addressed by using an independent sample t-test for each item included in Section Two of the NCLB (items 1-14). For each item the independent variable was educator category (principal, teacher) and the dependent variable was the item responses.

Research Question Four: "Are there statistically significant differences between educators in Title I schools and in non-Title I schools in their understanding of the Title I provisions of NCLB?" The question was addressed by using an independent sample t-test for each item included in Section Two of the NCLB (items 1-14). For each item the independent variable was school category (non-Title I, Title I) and the dependent variable

was the item responses.

Research Question Five: "What do classroom teachers believe to be the implications of the No Child Left Behind Act?" Descriptive statistics for each item included in Section Three of the NCLB (items 21-35) were used to address this question. Included were the means, standard deviations, and response frequencies of the teacher respondents.

Research Question Six: "What do principals believe to be the implications of the No Child Left Behind?" Descriptive statistics for each item included in Section Three of the NCLB (items 21-35) were used to address this question. Included were the means, standard deviations, and response frequencies of the principal respondents.

Research Question Seven: "Are there statistically significant differences between classroom teachers and principals regarding the implications of the No Child Left Behind Act?" The question was addressed by using an independent sample t-test for each item included in Section Three of the NCLB (items 21-35). For each item the independent variable was educator category (principal, teacher) and the dependent variable was the item responses.

Research Question Eight: "Are there statistically significant differences between educators in Title I and non-Title I schools regarding the implications of No Child Left Behind?" The question was addressed by using an independent sample t-test for each item included in Section Three of the NCLB (items 21-35). For each item the independent variable was school category (non-Title I, Title I) and the dependent variable was the item responses.

Summary

Guided by the eight research questions of the study, the electronic CNCLBRQ survey instrument was used to elicit responses from each of the subjects participating in the study. The instrument was validated by an expert panel and pilot tested. Cronbach's alpha was used to determine the internal consistency of the instrument. Demographic data was gathered for the purposes of effectively categorizing the participants in the study. Quantitative data was gathered from the instrument that provided information regarding educators' professed understanding and perceived implications of NCLB. The results of the respondents' responses on the CNCLBRQ were analyzed using descriptive and inferential statistics. Chapter Four presents a detailed analysis of the data.

CHAPTER FOUR

Data Analysis

Introduction

Chapter three included a discussion of the particular data design and procedures utilized in the current study, which was intended to determine the professed understanding and perceived implications of the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB) by both teachers and administrators. This current chapter presents the results of the study. It begins with a review of the methodology, followed by a presentation of the findings of the pilot test of the instrument used in the study. Finally, it concludes with a presentation of the results generated by the statistical procedures utilized to address the research questions that guided the study.

The study employed a quantitative design, utilizing both the descriptive and inferential procedures. Specific statistical procedures included the mean, standard deviation, distributional frequencies, and independent samples t-tests.

Results

The 35-question electronic survey was used to solicit data from teachers and principals in addressing the eight research questions that were intended to ascertain these educators' understanding of NCLB and their perceived implications of the legislation. The survey was made available to a randomly selected sample of 383 principals and teachers. Of these, 132 responded (85 teachers and 47 principals), yielding a response rate of 44%.

Section one, questions one through five of the instrument, included professional background questions. Items in this section asked each respondent to identify his/her

position (teacher or principal). The section additionally elicited information about respondents' years of experience in his/her current position and site grade levels. Additionally, each respondent was asked whether his/her school was currently under a plan of improvement.

Eighty-five of the 132 respondents were certified classroom teachers, with the remaining 47 respondents being building level principals or assistant principals. The average experience of the principals and classroom teachers was 9.5 years. The respondents in the study were employed at schools representing various grade levels across the K through 12 spectrum. A small majority of the respondents (57%) were employed in Title I schools.

Sections Two and Three were formatted equivalently. For each item, a respondent was asked to select among four choices, (strongly agree, agree, disagree, or strongly disagree). Scores were converted to numerical ratings to accommodate statistical analyses.

Section Two, consisting of items 1 though 14, was intended to measure respondents' professed understanding of NCLB. The results of Section Two were used to address research questions 1 through 4. Descriptive statistical analyses, including the mean, standard deviation, and response frequencies, were used to address research questions 1 and 2, while independent sample t-tests were utilized to address research questions 3 and 4.

Section Three, consisting of items 15 though 35, was intended to measure respondents' perceived implications of NCLB. The results of Section Three were used to address research questions 5 through 8. Descriptive statistical analyses, including the

mean, standard deviation, and response frequencies, were used to address research questions 5 and 6, while independent samples t-tests were utilized to address research questions 7 and 8.

The mean, the most common measure of central tendency, represents the sum of all the values in a data set divided by the total number of observations. The mean scores put into perspective all of the available values (Reid, 1987).

The standard deviation, "an index of the variability of scores about the means of a distribution" (Shavelson, 1996, p. 104) is the most common measure of dispersion. In effect, the standard deviation illustrates how representative the mean is to the total distribution. The scope of the standard deviation is determined by the size of the mean and the spread of the scores (Reid, 1987).

Frequencies of distributions were used in the data to indicate how many times each response occurred. The frequencies of values were converted into percentages using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS). The use of frequencies allowed the researcher to look for patterns in the data.

The independent sample t-test was the method used to determine whether the mean responses to the items on the instruments between groups (principals/teachers and non-Title I / Title I educators) were significantly different. Equality of variances between groups was tested using Levene's Test for Equality of Variances. For those items with significant heterogeneity distributions, the Levene corrections were employed allowing for proper inferences (Appendix C).

Understanding of the No Child Left Behind Act

Research Questions One through four were addressed using data generated by both Section One and Section Two of the CNCLBRQ. Following are the results of the statistical analyses, presented research question by question.

Research Question One

The first research question was, "To what extent do classroom teachers profess to understand the provisions of Title I of the No Child Left Behind Act?" Items 1-14 of the instrument were included in these analyses:

1. I understand the meaning of accountability under Title I of the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB).
2. I understand the meaning of Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) under NCLB.
3. I understand the meaning of statewide assessments under NCLB.
4. I understand the consequences to schools and districts that fail to make AYP.
5. I understand the consequences for teachers whose students fail to make AYP.
6. I understand the consequences to building level principals whose school fails to make AYP.
7. I understand the consequences for schools if their students fail to achieve 100% proficiency in reading and language arts, math and science by 2013-2014.
8. I understand the rights of parents if the school that their child is attending is identified as in need of improvement.
9. I understand that annual report cards are to be provided to parents from Title I schools only.

10. I am aware that 95% of each major subgroup must take the same statewide assessment under NCLB.
11. I am aware that assessment data will be disaggregated by the major subgroups.
12. I understand the required qualifications of educators, new and not new, under NCLB.
13. I understand the goals of NCLB.
14. I understand the correlation between the Academic Performance Index (API) Oklahoma's educational accountability system, and adequate yearly progress (AYP).

Table 1 presents the descriptive statistics generated from teacher responses to Section Two of the instrument. The results demonstrated that the lowest mean ratings were derived from question 6 (2.53), question 7 (2.53), and question 9 (2.53). The highest mean ratings were derived from question 2 (3.04), question 3 (3.02) and question 4 (3.00). More than three-fourths (78%) of the means were 2.53 or higher. Questions 1 (2.94) and Question 11 (2.96) were all substantially close to "Agree' (3 on the numerical scale).

The respondents' overall disagreement with question 9 (mean of 2.53), which states that annual report cards are to be provided to parents from Title I schools only, actually indicates that the respondents are aware of the provisions of the legislations requiring annual report cards to be provided to parents, both from Title I and non-Title I schools. The standard deviations did not vary dramatically across the items, ranging from .685 to .883.

Table 1

Descriptive Statistics of Teachers' Understanding of NCLB

Questions	Mean	Standard Deviation	N
Question 1	2.94	.717	84
Question 2	3.02	.711	84
Question 3	3.04	.685	84
Question 4	3.00	.698	83
Question 5	2.56	.883	84
Question 6	2.53	.825	85
Question 7	2.53	.881	85
Question 8	2.89	.787	85
Question 9	2.53	.749	85
Question 10	2.88	.793	85
Question 11	2.96	.823	85
Question 12	2.87	.768	85
Question 13	2.73	.734	85
Question 14	2.65	.734	85

Table 2 presents the frequency distribution of classroom teachers' responses to Section Two. The response frequencies illustrate that respondents were more in agreement with Questions 1-4 and 11 than with any of the other items in the Section. Most of the respondents (82%) "Agree" or "Strongly Agree" that they understand adequate yearly progress (AYP), statewide assessments, and the consequences to schools and school districts that fail to make AYP. The table also indicates that a higher

proportion of the respondents' professed understanding of the legislation is clustered around "Disagree" and "Agree."

Table 2

Frequencies of Teacher Responses to Section Two: Understanding of NCLB

Questions	SD	%	D	%	A	%	SA	%
Question 1	4	4.8	12	14.3	53	63.1	15	17.9
Question 2	3	3.6	11	13.1	51	60.7	19	22.6
Question 3	2	2.4	12	14.3	51	60.7	19	22.6
Question 4	2	2.4	14	16.9	49	59.0	18	21.7
Question 5	10	11.9	29	34.5	33	39.3	12	14.3
Question 6	7	8.2	37	43.5	30	35.3	11	12.9
Question 7	11	12.9	29	34.1	34	40.0	11	12.9
Question 8	4	4.7	19	22.4	44	51.8	18	21.2
Question 9	6	7.1	35	41.2	37	43.5	7	8.2
Question 10	4	4.7	20	23.5	43	50.6	18	21.2
Question 11	5	5.9	15	17.6	43	50.6	22	25.9
Question 12	3	3.5	22	25.9	43	50.6	17	20.0
Question 13	4	4.8	25	29.8	45	53.6	10	11.9
Question 14	6	7.1	29	34.1	39	45.9	11	12.9

Research Question Two

The second research question was, "To what extent do principals profess to understand the provisions of Title I of the No Child Left Behind Act?" Table 3 presents descriptive statistics generated from principal responses to Section Two of the instrument. The results demonstrated that the lowest mean rating was derived from question 9 (2.53), and the highest mean rating was derived from question 3 (3.33). As with the teachers, the standard deviation statistics were rather consistent across the items.

Table 3
Descriptive Statistics of Principals' Understanding of NCLB

Questions	Mean	Standard Deviation	N
Question 1	3.17	.732	47
Question 2	3.23	.729	47
Question 3	3.33	.598	46
Question 4	3.15	.759	46
Question 5	2.72	.743	47
Question 6	2.87	.859	46
Question 7	2.66	.867	47
Question 8	3.17	.564	47
Question 9	2.53	.905	47
Question 10	3.19	.798	47
Question 11	3.30	.778	47
Question 12	3.17	.761	47
Question 13	3.04	.779	47
Question 14	2.98	.766	47

Table 4 represents the frequency distribution of principals' responses to Section Two. The greatest proportion of respondents either "Agree" or "Strongly Agree" with the

statements measuring their understanding of NCLB. The proportion of these responses (64%) indicates that a greater number of respondents "Agree" to understanding the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001. In fact, only with question 9 did principals profess not to understand a component of the legislation (53.2% strongly disagreed or disagreed).

Table 4

Frequencies of Principal Responses to Section Two: Understanding of NCLB

Questions	SD	%	D	%	A	%	SA	%
Question 1	2	4.3	3	6.4	27	57.4	15	31.9
Question 2	1	2.1	5	10.6	23	48.9	18	38.3
Question 3	0	0	3	6.5	25	54.3	18	39.1
Question 4	2	4.3	4	8.7	25	54.3	15	32.6
Question 5	1	2.1	18	38.3	21	44.7	7	14.9
Question 6	2	4.3	14	30.4	18	39.1	12	26.1
Question 7	4	8.5	16	34.5	19	40.4	8	17.0
Question 8	0	0	4	8.5	31	66.0	12	25.5
Question 9	5	10.6	20	42.6	14	29.8	8	17.0
Question 10	2	4.3	5	10.6	22	46.8	18	38.3
Question 11	2	4.3	3	6.4	21	44.7	21	44.7
Question 12	2	4.3	4	8.5	25	53.2	16	34.0
Question 13	1	2.1	10	21.3	22	46.8	14	29.8
Question 14	1	2.1	11	23.4	23	48.9	12	25.5

Research Question Three

Are there statistically significant differences in the extent of professed understanding of provisions of Title I of the No Child Left Behind Act between principals and classroom teachers? A series of independent sample t-tests was utilized to address

the question. The independent samples included principals (group 1) and classroom teachers (group 2). The dependent variable for each t-test was mean item response.

Table 5 includes the results of the t-tests (full statistical results are contained in Appendix C). Comparison of the mean ratings of principals' responses to classroom teachers' responses were significantly different for each of the following questions: Question 3 (t = 2.415, sig. = .017), Question 6 (t=2.220, sig.= .028), Question 8 (t=2.121, sig. = .036), Question 10 (t=2.140, sig.= .034), Question 11 (t=2.270, sig.= .025), Question 12 (t=2.153, sig.= .033), Question 13 (t=2.315, sig.=.022, and Question 14 (t=2.320, sig.= .022). Items (1, 2, 4, 5, 7, and 9) indicated no significant differences.

Table 5

t-Tests Results: Principals vs. Teachers' Professed Understanding of NCLB

Research Questions	t	*df*	Sig. (2-tailed)
Question 1	1.746	129	.083
Question 2	1.609	129	.110
Question 3	2.415	128	.017*
Question 4	1.149	127	.284
Question 5	1.076	129	.284
Question 6	2.220	129	.028*
Question 7	.818	130	.415
Question 8	2.121	130	.036*
Question 9	.017	130	.986
Question 10	2.140	130	.034*
Question 11	2.270	130	.025*
Question 12	2.153	130	.033*
Question 13	2.315	130	.022*
Question 14	2.320	130	.022*

*indicates statistically significant at p<.05.

Research Question Four

Are there statistically significant differences in the extent of professed understanding provisions of Title I of the No Child Left Behind Act between educators in Title I schools and those in non-Title I schools? A series of independent sample t-tests were utilized to address the question. The independent samples included non-Title I educators (group 1) and Title I educators (group 2). The dependent variable for each t-test was mean item response.

Only question 9 (t=-3.154, sig.= .002), indicated a significant difference in the mean ratings between the two groups. The remaining 13 items (92 %) showed no significant differences between educators of Title I and non-Title I schools' understanding of NCLB.

Table 6

t-Tests Results: Non-Title I vs. Title I Educators' Professed Understanding of NCLB

Research Questions	*t*	*df*	Sig. (2-tailed)
Question 1	-.1953	124	.053
Question 2	.012	124	.990
Question 3	-.935	123	.352
Question 4	-.1570	122	.119
Question 5	-.294	124	.769
Question 6	-.703	124	.483
Question 7	-.737	125	.463
Question 8	-.415	125	.679
Question 9	-3.154	125	.002*
Question 10	-.641	125	.523
Question 11	-.815	125	.417
Question 12	-1.331	125	.186
Question 13	-.501	125	.617
Question 14	-1.019	125	.310

* indicates statistically significant at p<.05

Perceived Implications of the No Child Left Behind Act

Research Questions five through eight were addressed using data generated by both Section One and Section Three of the CNCLBRQ. Following are the results of the statistical analyses, presented research question by question.

Research Question Five

What do classroom teachers perceive to be the implications of the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001? Items 15-35 of the instrument were included in these analyses:

15. NCLB will benefit schools with multiple subgroups.
16. All children can meet the goals of NCLB regardless of their socioeconomic status.
17. All children can meet the goals of NCLB regardless of their disability.
18. All children can meet the goals of NCLB regardless of their race and ethnicity.
19. All children can meet the goals of NCLB regardless of their proficiency in English.
20. All children can meet the goals of NCLB regardless of parental support.
21. NCLB has substantially altered teaching practices.
22. NCLB has increased reliance on textbooks, workbooks, and worksheets for basic skills and content area instructions.
23. Disadvantaged children will be positively impacted by NCLB.
24. Special Education students will encounter greater difficulty than regular education students in meeting the goals of NCLB.
25. Because of NCLB, educators in this school spend more time working together to develop curriculum and plan instructions.

26. Because NCLB focuses schools on skills such as mathematics and reading, time devoted to other subjects has been reduced.
27. Educators in my school are supportive of NCLB.
28. NCLB will have a positive impact upon Title I schools.
29. Non-Title I schools are held to the same standards as Title I schools under NCLB.
30. Because of NCLB, educators will teach to the test.
31. The same academic performance standards should apply to all students.
32. Because of NCLB, more attention is given to state-dictated curricula and content.
33. Federal funding of NCLB is adequate.
34. State and local school funding systems are adequate to meet the goals of NCLB.
35. Funding mechanisms of Title I under NCLB is an improvement over previous Title I funding mechanisms.

The concomitant results are included in Table 7. The mean ratings were highest on item 24, which stated that special education students will encounter greater difficulty than regular education students in meeting the goals of NCLB (3.57), and item 30, stating that as a result of NCLB, more teachers will teach to the test (3.44). The lowest level of agreement was Question 17, indicating that respondents "Disagree" with the belief that all children can meet the goals of NCLB regardless of their disability (1.41). Although the present study did not include a comparison between the professed understanding and implications, a cursory examination of the mean scores between Section Two and Section Three indicates much higher levels of disagreement with Section Three items than with the items of Section Two.

Table 7

Descriptive Statistics of Teachers' Perceived Implications of NCLB

Research Questions	Mean	Standard Deviation	N	
Question 15	2.00	.772	85	
Question 16	1.74	.861	85	
Question 17	1.41	.583	85	
Question 18	2.24	.996	85	
Question 19	1.52	.610	85	
Question 20	1.53	.647	85	
Question 21	2.89	.939	85	
Question 22				2.75
Question 23	1.88	.747	85	
Question 24	3.57	.607	84	
Question 25				2.40
Question 26				2.98
Question 27	1.84	.705	85	
Question 28	1.93	.799	85	
Question 29	2.61	.742	85	
Question 30	3.44	.645	85	
Question 31	1.81	.779	85	
Question 32	3.13	.737	85	
Question 33	1.59	.863	85	
Question 34	1.47	.700	85	
Question 35	1.95	.671	85	

Table 8 presents the frequency distribution of teachers' responses to Section Three. Examination of the frequency distribution reveals the vast majority of respondents (94 %) either "Disagree" or "Strongly Disagree" with the statement included in item 17, which states that all children can meet the goals of NCLB regardless of their disability.

The vast majority (94.1 %) also "Disagree" or "Strongly Disagree" with the statement in item 19, stating that all children can meet the goals of NCLB regardless of their proficiency in English. The results also show that 92% of the respondents "Disagree" or "Strongly Disagree" with the statement included in item 34, which states that state and local funding systems are adequate to meet the goals of NCLB. The greatest proportion of responses across the items is clustered around "Disagree" or "Strongly Disagree."

Table 8

Frequencies of Teachers' Perceived Implications of NCLB

Research Questions	SD	%	D	%	A	%	SA	%
Question 15	24	28.2	38	44.7	22	25.9	1	1.2
Question 16	41	48.2	29	34.1	11	12.9	4	4.7
Question 17	54	63.5	27	31.8	4	4.7	0	0
Question 18	26	30.6	21	24.7	30	35.3	8	9.4
Question 19	46	54.1	34	40.0	5	5.9	0	0
Question 20	47	55.3	31	36.5	7	8.2	0	0
Question 21	7	8.2	21	24.7	31	36.5	26	30.6
Question 22	4	4.7	30	35.3	34	40.0	17	20.0
Question 23	26	30.6	46	54.1	10	11.8	3	3.5
Question 24	0	0	5	6.0	26	31.0	53	63.1
Question 25	12	14.1	27	31.8	46	54.1	0	0
Question 26	1	1.2	25	29.4	34	40.0	25	29.4
Question 27	29	34.1	41	48.2	15	17.6	0	0
Question 28	29	34.1	34	40.0	21	24.7	1	1.2
Question 29	5	5.9	31	36.5	41	48.2	8	9.4
Question 30	0	0	7	8.2	34	40.0	44	51.8
Question 31	32	37.6	40	47.1	10	11.8	3	3.5
Question 32	2	2.4	12	14.1	44	51.8	27	31.8
Question 33	52	61.2	20	23.5	9	10.6	4	4.7
Question 34	53	62.4	26	30.6	4	4.7	2	2.4
Question 35	21	24.7	47	55.3	17	20.0	0	0

Research Question Six

What do principals believe to be the implications of the No Child Left Behind Act?

Table 9 presents descriptive statistics generated from principals' responses to Section Three.

The highest mean response was to item 24 (3.62), which stated that special education students will encounter greater difficulty than regular education students in meeting the goals of NCLB. Next, item 30 (3.28) stated that, as a result of NCLB, more teachers will teach to the test. The lowest mean level of agreement was item 33 (1.36) indicating respondents' disagreement with the belief that federal funding is adequate. The greatest proportion of the mean ratings "Disagree" with the statements.

Standard deviations were generally consistent across the items.

Table 9

Descriptive Statistics of Principals' Perceived Implications of NCLB

Questions	Mean	Standard Deviation	N
Question 15	2.43	.744	47
Question 16	2.02	.766	47
Question 17	1.52	.547	46
Question 18	2.36	.792	47
Question 19	1.72	.615	47
Question 20	1.83	.789	47
Question 21	2.85	.751	47
Question 22	2.38	.534	47
Question 23	2.17	.761	47
Question 24	3.62	.534	47
Question 25	2.57	.580	47
Question 26	2.83	.732	47
Question 27	1.96	.658	47
Question 28	2.23	.633	47
Question 29	2.57	.744	47
Question 30			3.28
Question 31	1.87	.749	46
Question 32	3.06	.763	47
Question 33	1.36	.673	47
Question 34	1.40	.577	47
Question 35	1.98	.608	47

Table 10 shows some extreme response ratings on both ends of the scale. The highest percentage of respondents (93.6%) "Disagree" or "Strongly Disagree" with item 33 which states that federal funding of NCLB is adequate. The item with the largest proportion of agreement was 24 (97.9%) which states that special education students will encounter greater difficulty than regular education students in meeting the goals of NCLB.

Table 10

Frequencies of Principals' Perceived Implications of NCLB

Questions	SD	%	D	%	A	%	SA	%
Question 15	5	10.6	19	40.4	21	44.7	2	4.3
Question 16	12	25.5	23	48.9	11	23.4	1	2.1
Question 17	23	50.0	22	47.8	1	2.2	0	0
Question 18	8	17.0	15	31.9	23	48.9	1	2.1
Question 19	17	36.2	26	55.3	4	8.5	0	0
Question 20	18	38.3	20	42.6	8	17.0	1	2.1
Question 21	2	4.3	11	23.4	26	55.3	8	17.0
Question 22	1	2.1	27	57.4	19	40.4	0	0
Question 23	9	19.1	22	46.8	15	31.9	1	2.1
Question 24	0	0	1	2.1	16	34.0	30	63.8
Question 25	2	4.3	16	34.0	29	61.7	0	0
Question 26	1	2.1	14	29.8	24	51.1	8	17.0
Question 27	11	23.4	27	57.4	9	19.1	0	0
Question 28	5	10.6	26	55.3	16	34.0	0	0
Question 29	3	6.4	18	38.3	22	46.8	4	8.5
Question 30	0	0	3	6.4	28	59.6	16	34.0
Question 31	14	30.4	26	56.5	4	8.7	2	4.3
Question 32	2	4.3	6	12.8	26	55.3	13	27.7
Question 33	34	72.3	10	21.3	2	4.3	1	2.1
Question 34	30	63.8	15	31.9	2	4.3	0	0
Question 35	9	19.1	30	63.8	8	17.0	0	0

Research Question Seven

Are there statistically significant differences between classroom teachers and principals regarding the perceived implications of the No Child Left Behind Act? A series of independent sample t-tests were utilized to address the question. The independent samples included principals (group 1) and classroom teachers (group 2). The dependent variable for each t-test was the mean item response.

Table 11 shows the *t*-test values for the comparisons of the mean ratings between classroom teachers and principals regarding the implications of the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001. Statistical significant differences were indicated for item 15 (t=3.072, sig. =.003), item 20 (t=2.359, sig. =.020), item 22 (t=-2.756, sig. =.007), item 23 (t=2.107, sig. =.037), and item 28 (t=2.252, sig. =.026) Conversely, there were no statistically significant differences between the mean ratings of classroom teachers and principals for items 16,17,18,19,20,21,24,25,26,27, and 29-35.

Table 11

t-Test Results: Principals vs. Teachers' Perceived Implications of NCLB

Questions	*t*	*df*	Sig. (2-tailed)
Question 15	3.072	130	.003*
Question 16	1.859	130	.065
Question 17	1.052	129	.295
Question 18	.749	130	.455
Question 19	1.851	130	.066
Question 20	2.359	130	.020*
Question 21	-2.70	130	.788
Question 22	-2.756	130	.007*
Question 23	2.107	130	.037*
Question 24	.430	129	.668
Question 25	1.414	130	.160
Question 26	-1.038	130	.301
Question 27	.976	130	.331
Question 28	2.252	130	.026*
Question 29	-2.76	130	.783
Question 30	-1.404	130	.163
Question 31	.411	129	.682
Question 32	.484	130	.630
Question 33	-1.556	130	.122
Question 34	-.554	130	.581
Question 35	.218	130	.827

* indicates statistically significant at $p<.05$

Research Question 8

Are there statistically significant differences between educators in Title I and non-Title I schools regarding the perceived implications of No Child Left Behind? A series of

independent sample t-tests were utilized to address the question. The independent samples included non-Title I educators (group 1) and Title I educators (group 2). The dependent variable for each t-test was mean item response.

In the comparison of mean ratings between Title I and non-Title I schools on the issue of the perceived implications of the No Child Behind legislations, Table 12 presents the results of these analyses. In five of the 21 items, statistically significant differences between Title I and non-Title I educators were indicated: 15 (t=-2.033, sig. =.044), item 27 (t=-2.867, sig. =.005), item 31 (t=-2.976, sig. =.004), item 33 (t=-2.960, sig. =.004), and item 34 (t=-1.723, sig. =.011). The remaining 16 items (16-26, 28,29,30,32, and 35) were not statistically significant

Table 12

t-Test Results: Title I and Non-Title I Educators' Perceived Implications of NCLB

Questions	*t*	*df*	Sig. (2-tailed)
Question 15	-2.033	125	.044*
Question 16	-.929	125	.355
Question 17	-1.256	124	.212
Question 18	.294	125	.769
Question 19	-1.793	125	.075
Question 20	-1.696	125	.092
Question 21	1.070	125	.287
Question 22	-.115	125	.908
Question 23	.340	125	.734
Question 24	.588	124	.558
Question 25	-1.563	125	.121
Question 26	-1.757	125	.081
Question 27	-2.867	125	.005*
Question 28	-.077	125	.939
Question 29	-1.366	125	.174
Question 30	1.210	125	.228
Question 31	-2.976	124	.004*
Question 32	.592	125	.555
Question 33	-2.960	125	.004*
Question 34	-2.573	125	.011*
Question 35	-1.723	125	.087

* indicates statistically significant at $p<.05$

Summary of the Results

Research question one of the present study, to what extent do classroom teachers profess to understand the provisions of the No Child Left Behind Act, is best addressed through the analysis of components of the legislation rather than holistically. The evidence indicates, however, that classroom teachers believe that they understand accountability, adequate yearly progress, statewide assessments and the consequences of schools and districts failing to make AYP. With mean scores clustered between "Disagree" and "Agree" on the instrument (from 2.53 to 2.94) for the remaining 10 items, the data suggest that teachers' profess to have some understanding of these provisions.

Research question two of the present study, to what extent do principals' profess to understand the provisions of the No Child Left Behind Act, should also be addressed according to components. The evidence indicates, however, that principals understand the following provisions of the legislation:

- The meaning of accountability under NCLB,
- The meaning of Adequate Yearly Progress under NCLB,
- The meaning of statewide assessment under NCLB,
- The consequences to schools and school districts that fail to make AYP,
- The rights of parents if the schools that their child is attending is identified as in need of improvement,
- 95% of each major subgroup must take the same statewide assessments under NCLB,
- the assessment data must be disaggregated by the major subgroups,

- The required qualifications of educators, new and not new, under NCLB,
- The goals of NCLB, and
- The correlation between Academic Performance Index (API), Oklahoma's educational accountability system, and AYP.

With means scores clustered between "Disagree" and "Agree" on the instrument (from 2.53 to 2.87) for the remaining items (questions 5, 6, 7, and 9), the data suggest that principals profess to also have some understanding of these provisions.

Research question three of the present study asked, "Are there statistically significant differences in the extent of the professed understanding of the No Child Left Behind Act between principals and classroom teachers?" The data revealed statistically significant differences between classroom teachers' and principals' professed understanding of NCLB on the following provisions:

- Statewide assessment;
- The consequences to building level principals whose school fails to make AYP;
- The rights of parents if the school that their child is attending is identified as in need of improvement;
- 95% of each major subgroup must take the same statewide assessment;
- Disaggregation of data by the major subgroups;
- The goals of NCLB; and
- The correlation between Academic Performance Index, Oklahoma's accountability system, and AYP.

Research question four of the present study asked, "Are there statistically significant differences between educators in Title I and in non-Title I schools in their understanding of the provisions of NCLB?" The only area in which Title I educators and non-Title I educators disagreed was in the area of annual report cards. In all other areas, no differences in their professed understanding of NCLB were found.

Research question five of the present study asked, what do classroom teachers believe to be the implications of the No Child Left Behind Act? This is best addressed through the analysis of components of the legislation rather than holistically. The evidence indicates that classroom teachers' perceive the following to be implications of NCLB:

- NCLB will not benefit schools with multiple subgroups.
- Classroom teachers do not believe that all children can meet the goals of NCLB and that a child's socioeconomic status can be a factor in not meeting the goals of the legislation.
- Classroom teachers do not believe that all children can meet the goals of NCLB and that a child's disability can be a factor in not meeting the goals of the legislation.
- Classroom teachers believe that not all children can meet the goals of NCLB and that race and ethnicity can be a factor in not meeting the goals of the legislation.
- Classroom teachers believe that not all children can meet the goals of NCLB and that limited English proficiency can be a factor in not meeting the goals of the legislation.

- Classroom teachers believe that not all children can meet the goals of NCLB and that lack of parental support can be a factor in not meeting the goals of the legislation.
- Classroom teachers nearly agree that NCLB has substantially altered teaching practices.
- Classroom teachers marginally agree that NCLB has increased reliance on textbooks, workbooks, and worksheets more than they once did for basic skills or content area instruction.
- Classroom teachers do not believe that disadvantaged children will be positively impacted by NCLB.
- Classroom teachers believe that special education students will encounter greater difficulty than regular education students in meeting the goals of NCLB.
- Classroom teachers do not believe that they spend more time working together to develop curriculum and plan instructions as a result of NCLB.
- Classroom teachers marginally agree (2.98 mean score) that schools focus more on skills such as mathematics and reading and has reduced time devoted to other subjects as a result of NCLB.
- Classroom teachers do not believe that educators in their school are supportive of NCLB.
- Classroom teachers do not believe that NCLB will have a positive impact upon Title I schools.
- Classroom teachers do not believe that non-Title I schools are held to the

same standards as Title I schools.

- Classroom teachers believe that because of NCLB, educators will teach to the test.
- Classroom teachers do not believe that the same academic performance standards should apply to all students.
- Classroom teachers believe that because of NCLB, more attention is given to state-dictated curricula and content.
- Classroom teachers do not believe that federal funding is adequate.
- Classroom teachers do not believe that state and local funding systems are adequate to meet the goals of NCLB.
- Classroom teachers do not believe that the funding mechanisms of Title I under NCLB are an improvement over previous Title I funding mechanisms.

Research question six of the present study asked, "what do principals believe to be the implications of the No Child Left Behind Act?" and is best addressed through the analysis of components of the legislation rather than holistically. The evidence indicates that principals, generally, are in agreement with classroom teachers about perceived implications of the legislation. The evidence indicates that principals perceive the implications to be as follows:

- NCLB will not benefit schools with multiple subgroups.
- Principals do not believe that all children can meet the goals of NCLB and that a child's socioeconomic status can be a factor in not meeting the goals of the legislation.

- Principals do not believe that all children can meet the goals of NCLB and that a child's disability can be a factor in not meeting the goals of the legislation.
- Principals believe that not all children can meet the goals of NCLB and that race and ethnicity can be a factor in not meeting the goals of the legislation.
- Principals believe that not all children can meet the goals of NCLB and that limited English proficiency can be a factor in not meeting the goals of the legislation.
- Principals believe that not all children can meet the goals of NCLB and that lack of parental support can be a factor in not meeting the goals of the legislation.
- Principals slightly disagree that NCLB has substantially altered teaching practices.
- Principals do not believe that NCLB has increased reliance on textbooks, workbooks, and worksheets more than they once did for basic skills or content area instruction.
- Principals do not believe that disadvantaged children will be positively impacted by NCLB.
- Principals believe that special education students will encounter greater difficulty than regular education students in meeting the goals of NCLB.
- Principals do not believe that they spend more time working together to develop curriculum and plan instructions as a result of NCLB.

- Principals slightly disagree that schools focus more on skills such as mathematics and reading and has reduced time devoted to other subjects as a result of NCLB.
- Principals do not believe that educators in their school are supportive of NCLB.
- Principals do not believe that NCLB will have a positive impact upon Title I schools.
- Principals do not believe that non-Title I schools are held to the same standards as Title I schools.
- Principals believe that because of NCLB, educators will teach to the test.
- Principals do not believe that the same academic performance standards should apply to all students.
- Principals believe that because of NCLB, more attention is given to state-dictated curricula and content.
- Principals do not believe that federal funding is adequate.
- Principals do not believe that state and local funding systems are adequate to meet the goals of NCLB.
- Principals do not believe that the funding mechanisms of Title I under NCLB are an improvement over previous Title I funding mechanisms.

Research question seven of the present study asked, are there statistically significant differences between teachers and principals regarding the implications of the No Child Left Behind Act? Statistical significant differences existed between classroom teachers' and principals' perceived implications of the act, with principals more generally

agreeing on the following when compared to teachers:

- NCLB will benefit multiple subgroups.
- All children can meet the goals of NCLB regardless of parental support.
- NCLB has increased reliance on textbooks, workbooks, and worksheets more than they once did for basic skills or content area instructions.
- Disadvantaged children will be positively impacted by NCLB, and
- NCLB will have a positive impact upon Title I schools.

For each of the other implication areas of Section Three, teachers and principals were in agreement.

Finally, research question eight of the present study asked, are there statistically significant differences between educators in Title I and non-Title I schools regarding the implications of the No Child Left Behind Act? Statistical significant differences in the perceived implications between Title I and non-Title I educators were found in the following areas:

- NCLB will benefit schools with multiple subgroups
- Educators are supportive of NCLB
- The same academic performance standards should apply for all students.
- Federal funding of NCLB is adequate, and
- State and local funding systems are adequate to meet the goals of NCLB.

For each of the other implication areas of Section Three, Title I and non-Title I educators were in agreement.

Summary

This chapter described the data collected for the study and the methods used to address the eight research questions guiding the study. This chapter began with an overview and presentation of the results of the pilot study. The results of the principals, classroom teachers, Title I and non-Title I educators' analyses were presented both in tabular and textual format. Chapter Five includes a summary, conclusions, and implications based on these results.

CHAPTER FIVE

Findings, Conclusions, Implications, and Recommendations

This chapter begins with a review of the study. Subsequent to the review, a summary of the major findings are discussed based on the results obtained in Chapter Four. Next, the conclusions derived from the study based on the major findings are presented. The contributions of the findings related to the literature are then presented along with the implications and recommendations obtained from the findings of the study.

Review of the Study

Purpose

The purpose of this study was to examine educators' professed understanding and believed implications of the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB). Also, the research was intended to make comparisons between principals and teachers and between Title I and non-Title I educators' understanding and perceived implications of the legislation. Eight research questions guided this study:

1. To what extent do classroom teachers profess to understand the provisions of Title I of the No Child Left Behind Act?
2. To what extent do principals profess to understand the provisions of Title I of the No Child Left Behind Act?
3. Are there statistically significant differences in the extent of understanding provisions of Title I of the No Child Left Behind Act between principals and classroom teachers?
4. Are there statistically significant differences between educators in Title I and

non-Title I schools in their understanding of the Title I provisions of NCLB?

5. What do classroom teachers believe to be the implications of the No Child Left Behind Act?
6. What do principals believe to be the implications of the No Child Left Behind Act?
7. Are there statistically significant differences between classroom teachers and principals regarding the implications of the No Child Left Behind Act?
8. Are there statistically significant differences between educators in Title I and non-Title I schools regarding the implications of No Child Left Behind?

These questions warranted examination because the most recent reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, NCLB, has set a new precedent for the level of federal involvement in public education, placing far-reaching demands upon educators.

Procedure

The population for this study was comprised of classroom teachers and principals from school districts across the state of Oklahoma currently employed in Title I and non-Title I schools. The data were obtained from participants' responses to the electronic Comprehensive No Child Left Behind Reform Questionnaire (CNCLBRQ). The instrument, validated by an expert panel and pilot tested, was designed to evaluate educators' professed understanding and their perceived implications of the legislation.

The instrument was divided into Three Sections. Section One included items that elicited demographic data from the respondents. Section Two included items that addressed respondents' professed understanding of specific Title I provisions. Section

Three included items that addressed respondents perceived implications of specific Title I provisions of NCLB. The educators rated their level of agreement with the 35 items included in the final two sections of the instrument by selecting from the following likert scale: "Strongly Disagree," "Disagree," "Agree," and "Strongly Agree."

The results of the study were analyzed using quantitative procedures. Descriptive statistical analyses, including the mean scores, standard deviations, and frequencies, were utilized to address research questions 1, 2, 5, and 6. Higher mean scores were indicative of greater overall agreement with an item statement. Larger frequencies indicated that more respondents concurred on a given choice. Independent sample t-tests were used to address research questions 3, 4, 7, and 8. The level of significance was evaluated at the customary $p<0.05$.

Major Findings

The purpose of the study was to examine educators' professed understanding and perceived implications of NCLB. Since the newly revised legislation was signed into law on January 8, 2002, far-reaching demands have been placed upon public school educators. Given its magnitude and pervasiveness, educators must be confident in their knowledge and the understanding of the legislation in order to meet its stated goals. The major findings of the eight research questions were as follows:

Research Question 1

To what extent do classroom teachers profess to understand the provisions of Title I of the No Child Left Behind Act?

A number of observations stem from the results presented in chapter four. Among the various Title I provisions examined in the study, classroom teachers have a

better understanding of adequate yearly progress (AYP), statewide assessment, and the consequences to schools and school districts that fail to make AYP. Conversely, the results show that teachers have a marginal understanding of the consequences to teachers and to building level principals if their respective schools fail to make AYP. This finding seems to be an anomaly because classroom teachers do not confirm their understanding of the consequences to schools if their students fail to achieve 100% proficiency in reading and language arts, math and science by 2013-2014. Similarly, evidence from the study suggests that while classroom teachers profess to having an understanding of the core of the legislation, (e.g. accountability), they profess a slight understanding (mean scores of 2.65 and 2.73 respectively) of their states' single accountability system and the goals of the legislation.

Research Question 2

To what extent do principals profess to understand the provisions of Title I of the No Child Left Behind Act?

The results of the study show that principals have a strong understanding of the majority of the Title I provisions that were examined. Similar to classroom teachers, however, principals confirm that they marginally comprehend the consequences to schools if students fail to achieve 100% proficiency in reading/language arts, math and science by 2013-2014. The result from item 9 (mean score of 2.53) indicate that principals understand the federal mandate requiring each state, each school, and each district to report annually to all parents. Item 14 documented principals' understanding of the connection between Academic Performance Index, and AYP.

Research Question 3

Are there statistically significant differences in the extent of understanding provisions of Title I of the No Child Left Behind Act between principals and classroom teachers?

The results of the study indicate that principals and teachers claim different levels of understanding related to statewide assessment including the disaggregation of data, the consequences to principals if their school fails to make AYP, parental choice, teacher qualifications, the goals of NCLB and the connection between their states single accountability system and the legislation. Specifically, the results show that principals profess to have a better understanding of each of these provisions of the legislation.

Research Question 4

Are there statistically significant differences between educators in Title I and non-Title I schools in their understanding of the Title I provisions of NCLB?

The results indicate that, overall, there was no significant differences between educators' from Title I and non-Title I schools in their understanding of NCLB. However, the marginal difference between the groups in their understanding of arguably the most important component of the legislation (accountability) is significant.

Research Question 5

What do classroom teachers believe to be the implications of the No Child Left Behind Act?

Through analysis of the results of the survey, a number of observations can be made. Classroom teachers believe that the legislation will negatively impact students enrolled in special education, Title I schools, disadvantaged children, and multiple subgroups. Classroom teachers do not believe that all students should be held to the same

academic standards and teachers will teach to the test. While the legislation issues no directives (except for provisions requiring "scientifically based instructional programs" and "highly qualified teachers") regarding curriculum or instructional practices, classroom teachers marginally agree that schools focus more on skills such as mathematics and reading and have reduced time devoted to other subjects as a result of the act. Classroom teachers nearly agree that NCLB has substantially altered teaching practices and that the legislation has increased reliance on textbooks, workbooks, and worksheets for basic skills and content area.

According to the literature, bipartisan support was give to NCLB because of its promises to fund the legislation (Cowan, 2004). In fact, the law declares that states will not be required "to spend any funds or incur any costs not paid for under the act" (P.L. 107-110). Classroom teachers strongly believe that the funds authorized by Congress to finance NCLB are not an improvement over past funding mechanisms, and that these funds are inadequate to meet the stated goals of the legislation.

Research Question 6

What do principals believe to be the implications of the No Child Left Behind?

Principals believe that an implication of NCLB is that special education students will have greater difficulty in meeting the goals of the legislation in comparison to general education students. The literature documents that this component is riddled in controversy and ultimately perceived as being counterproductive (Cowan, 2004). The principals additionally indicate that the same academic standards should not be required of all students and that multiple subgroups, disadvantaged children, and that Title I schools will be negatively impacted. While principals come close to stating that teaching

practices have been altered as a result of the legislation and that teachers in their building do not spend any more time working together to develop curriculum prior to NCLB, these principals substantially confirm that teachers will more likely teach to the test. Similarly, principals strongly suggest that the funds legislated to finance NCLB are inadequate.

Research Question 7

Are there statistically significant differences between classroom teachers and principals regarding the implications of the No Child Left Behind Act?

Classroom teachers and principals perceived the implications of NCLB differently in several areas. First, teachers as compared to principals have a stronger discernment of the disadvantages of NCLB for schools with multiple subgroups. Second, teachers strongly believe that it will be difficult for all students to reach the goals of the legislation without the support of parents. In contrast, while principals believe that students need the support of parents to reach the goals of the legislation, they do not view the support of parents as strongly as teachers. Third, classroom teachers clearly believe that disadvantaged children will be negatively impacted by the legislation. Similarly, while principals, overall, believe that NCLB will not positively impact disadvantaged children, they do not perceive this as strongly as teachers. Finally, whereas classroom teachers somewhat agree that NCLB has increased their reliance on textbooks, workbooks, and worksheets for basic skills and content area instruction, principals do not concur.

Research Question 8

Are there statistically significant differences between educators in Title I and non-Title I schools regarding the implications of No Child Left Behind?

The results of the findings indicate statistically significant differences between educators in Title I and non-Title I schools in their perceived implications of NCLB. Educators from both groups, overall, rejected the beliefs that NCLB will benefit multiple subgroups, that educators in their building supported the legislation that all children should be held to the same academic standards, and that federal and state funding is adequate to support the legislation.

Conclusions

The major conclusions drawn from analysis of the results include:

1. Educators' professed understanding of NCLB was generally consistent across grade levels and between Title I and non-Title I schools.
2. Educators profess to understand what has been called the hallmark of NCLB, accountability and assessment. However, classroom teachers are unable to fully relate their understanding of accountability under NCLB to their statewide accountability system.
3. Educators profess to understand adequate yearly progress (AYP); however, they do not understand the consequences (sanctions) to principals and teachers whose schools fail to make AYP. These results suggest that while classroom teachers and principals understand the distinct steps and definition of AYP (timeline, starting point, intermediate goals, annual measurable objectives, other academic indicators, and minimum requirements), they lack an understanding of the possible consequences (sanctions) levied upon educators if their school fails to make AYP.

4. Educators confirm that they understand that each school district must widely disseminate to parents and the public report cards to include data about student achievement on state assessments, other academic indicators, teacher qualifications and schools identified as in need of improvement.
5. Educators profess to understand the rights of parents under NCLB. This suggests that classroom teachers and principals understand that school districts must offer parents the option of either transferring their children to other schools or enrolling them in supplemental educational services (at the district's expense) if the school that their children are attending fails to make AYP for two consecutive years.
6. Educators understand their state's definition of "highly qualified teacher."
7. Educators are aware of the goals of NCLB, suggesting that teachers and principals understand the ultimate goal of the legislation, which is to close the academic achievement gaps between disadvantaged students and their more affluent counterparts, majority and minority students, as well as high performing and low performing students.
8. Principals have a clearer professed understanding of the Title I provisions of NCLB as compared to classroom teachers.
9. Educators believe that NCLB will have negative consequences to schools with multiple subgroups, Title I schools, children with disabilities, limited English language learners, and disadvantaged children.
10. Educators believe that the same academic standards should not apply to all students.

11. Educators confirm that NCLB, specifically accountability, has forced schools and school district to adhere to the state-dictated curricula which will force teachers to teach to the test.
12. Educators do not believe that all children will or can meet the goals of NCLB for a variety of reasons.
13. Educators, including those from Title I and non-Title I schools, believe that funding is inadequate to finance the mandates outlined in the prescribed legislation.
14. Classroom teachers clearly suggest that the perceived disadvantages of the legislation outweigh its advantages.
15. Finally, educators are consistent in their lack of support for NCLB.

Contributions of the Findings to the Literature on No Child Left Behind

The findings of this study will add to the existing but limited literature about this topic. The reauthorized comprehensive federal education reform act of 2001, concomitant with earlier revisions of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, has changed the landscape of public education generally and the role of classroom teachers and building level principals specifically. As described in chapter two, the linchpin of NCLB, accountability, demands greater responsibility on the part of public school educators in the educating of America's children . Major provisions of Title I of NCLB were discussed in detail in chapter two, along with arguments assailing the conditions of American education. With prescriptive demands placed upon educators to bridge the academic achievement gap between all students, specifically between high and low performing students while promoting school reform in high-poverty schools, this study

has made a contribution to the literature by examining the extent of educators' understanding of the new law and its perceived implications.

Implications

The purpose of the study was to examine educators' understanding and believed implications of Title I provisions of the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001.

The results of the current study suggest the following implications:

1. NCLB was enacted on January 8, 2002, and took effect on July 1, 2002. Yet, three years later, the results suggest that classroom teachers do not clearly understand major components of the law.
2. Principals have an understanding of the major provision of the law. However, they perceive the legislation as fostering negative consequences for public school children.
3. Classroom teachers acknowledge that they do not fully understand major provisions of the law, but profess to understand some of the components well enough to discern counterproductive consequences of the legislation.
4. Educators have substantial concerns about holding students with disabilities and limited English language learners to the same standards as other students.
5. Educators do not support NCLB partially because they view the act as being under funded and because the goals are unattainable for all children.
6. The findings do not adequately address the fiscal allocations of NCLB.
7. The findings do not adequately address educators from schools currently under a plan of improvement.

8. The findings do not address central office administrators and their professed understanding and believed implications of NCLB.
9. The results suggest a need for state and local education agencies to implement additional staff development workshops training educators, specifically classroom teachers, on NCLB.
10. The results of the study suggest that while educators do not support the legislation, they are implementing NCLB.
11. This research holds merit for any educator attempting to encourage legislators to modify NCLB.

Recommendations

The following recommendations are suggested based on the findings and the conclusions of the study:

1. Educators want to voice their thoughts about NCLB. As we progress under the auspices of the legislation, more qualitative study using open-ended questioning methodologies are needed. Though this study did not include interviews or even open-ended survey questions, a number of comments were made by the pilot test respondents. Examples of respondents' comments included the following:

> As often the case, the authors of NCLB are living on the edge of what they perceive as the perfect world. As educators, we deal with people, not with objects. One can mandate higher production rates in factories, corporations, etc., but dealing with the whole human being with all of their complexities is a whole different ball game. Medical, psychological, social, and environmental scientists are still trying to figure out how the human mind functions and learns. What makes legislators think children learn because they slap largely unfunded mandates on their teachers? That's the most far-out theory!

Another respondent had this to say:

> I understand some of the concept of the No Child Left Behind legislation. It has its good points by making schools teach, but it also has its down side. Students are now only taught what teachers know will be on the test or believe will be on the test. In other words, if the teacher is going to be successful, they will have to teach to the test. So students are not taught over a broad spectrum of knowledge anymore. Because a good teacher does not have time to teach what will be on the test and also cover areas of interest related to the subject, students are taught more and more about less and less and less about more. I would like to see a better middle of the road education for children where they can be taught a little on a broad area, and still go into depth on specific standards. As a classroom teacher, I now worry more about testing than learning.

2. The study was quantitative in nature. However, qualitative research could be conducted to study the perceived implications of the legislation from the state department of education, local education agencies, parent groups, and the legislature.
3. This study was limited in scope to educators' understanding and perceived implications surrounding the major provisions of Title I, Subpart A of NCLB. Further studies on NCLB could be broader in scope and encompass the remaining subparts of Title I, which could result in different findings.

Summary

This chapter provided a review of the purpose of the study, the research questions addressed, and the methods used to conduct the study. The key findings were presented, which established the context for implications and future recommendations.

Eight questions were asked. Questions one through four sought to determine educators' (defined as classroom teachers and principals in the study) professed

understanding of NCLB. Questions five through eight sought to determine educators' perceived implications of NCLB.

The conclusions drawn were that classroom teachers and principals differ on their degree of understanding of major provisions of Title I of NCLB, with principals having a clearer understanding of the law. Despite their level of understanding, both groups do not support NCLB. Educators from Title I schools understand NCLB similarly to those from non-Title I schools.

Classroom teachers have stronger beliefs regarding inferences drawn from their understanding of the legislation. However, the level of significance varied across instrument items. The implications drawn from Title I and non-Title I schools produced similar results as those of classroom teachers and principals.

Finally, the results of educators' professed understanding and perceived implications of NCLB drew myriad conclusions, implications, and recommendations for future studies. With an appealing subtitle, "No Child Left Behind" (borrowed from Marian Wright Edleman's "Leave No Child Behind" of the Children's Defense Fund), the reauthorized Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 promises much discourse in the months and years ahead.

References

Alabama Coalition for Equity, Inc., et al., v. Hunt (1993 wl 204083 (AlA. CIR)).

Babbie, E. (1973). *Survey Research Methods*. Belmont, CA:Wadsworth Publishing Company, Inc.

Berliner, D.C. & Biddle, B.J. (1995). *The manufactured crisis.* Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Borg, W.R., & Gall, M.D. (1989). *Educational research*. New York, NY: Longman.

Bowsher, J.E. (2001). *Fix schools first.* Gaithersburg, MD: Aspen Publishers.

Bracey, G. (2003). April foolishness: The 20th anniversary of a nation at risk. *Phi Delta Kappan, 84*(8), 616-621.

Bracey, G. (2002). Raising achievement of at-risk students-or not. *Phi Delta Kappan*, February, 2002, 431-432.

Bradley, A. (1993). Mission impossible? From risk to renewal: Charting a course for reform. Educational Projects in Education. Washington, D.C.: *Education Week*.

Braverman, G. (2003). No Child Left Behind Act leaves schools no wiggle room. *Michigan Association of School Boards Journal.* Spring, 2003.

Brown v. Board of Education, 347 U.S. 483(74 S. Ct. App. 1954).

Broder, D. (2000). Long road to reform: negotiators forge education legislation. *Washington Post*. December 17, p.A1

Carter, E.F. (1983). *A study of compensatory and elementary education: The sustaining effect study*. Menlo Park, CA.: System Development Corporation, p. 4-13.

Carnoy, M., Elmore, R., & Siskins, L. (2003). *The new accountability.* New York, NY: Routlege Falmer.

Carneige Commission on Teaching as a Profession. (1986). *A nation prepared: Teachers for the 21st Century*. Hyattsville, Maryland: Carneige Forum on Education and the Economy.

Citizens' Commission on Civil Rights. (1999). *Title I in midstream: the fight to improve schools for poor kids.* Washington, D.C.: Author.

Citizen' Commission on Civil Rights. (1999). *The struggle to meet basic needs*. Washington, D.C.: Author

Coleman, J.S., Campbell, E., Hobson, C., McPartland, J., Mood, A., Weinfeld, F., & York, R. (1966). *Equality of Educational Opportunity.* Washington, D.C. U.S. Government Printing Office.

Cowan, K. (2003). *The new Title I: The changing landscape of accountability.* Washington, D.C.: Thompson Publishing Group, Inc.

Cowan, K. (2004). *The new Title I: The changing landscape of accountability.* Washington, D.C.: Thompson Publishing Group, Inc.

Crewell, J.W. (1998). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: choosing any five traditions*. Newbury Park, CA.: Sage Publications.

Darling-Hammond, L. (2004). From "Separate but Equal" to "No Child Left Behind": The collision of new standards and old inequalities. In G. Wood and D. Meier (Ed.). *Many Children Left Behind*. (pp. 3-32). Boston, MA: Beacon Press.

Darling-Hammond, L. (2000). *Teacher quality and student achievement: A review of state policy evidence.* Retrieved on October 3, 2000 from http://epaa.asu.edu/epaa'v8n1/.

Education Trust Bulletin. (2002). The other gap: Poor students receive fewer dollars."March 6, 2002.

Edgewood Independent School District v. Kirby, 777 S.W. 2d 391 (1989).

Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, Pub. L. 89-10.

Enrolled House Bill 1017 of the First Extraordinary Session of the 42nd Legislature, *Oklahoma Education Reform Act of 1990*.

Evers, W.M., & Walberg, H.J. (2002). *Schools accountability.* Stanford, CA: Hoover Institution Press.

Finn, C.E., & Olin, J.W. (2002). *What ails U.S. high schools? How should they be reformed?* Paper prepared for the Office of Vocational and Adult Education, U.S. Department of Education, Washington, D.C.

Finn, C. (2001). *State academic standards*. In D. Ravitch (Ed.). Prepared for Brookings Paper on Education Policy.

Firestone W.A., Rosenblum, S., Bader, B.D., & Massed, D. (1991). Education reform from 1983 to 1990: State action and district response. *Consortium for Policy Research in Education, Research Report Series RR-021*, December, Rutgers, et al.

Gall, M., Borg, D. & Gall, G. (1996). *Educational Research an Introduction*. White Plains, N.Y.: Longman Publishers.

General Accounting Office. (2002). *Title I funding: poor children benefit through funding.* January, 2002 (GAO-02-242). Washington, D.C.: Author

General Accounting Office. (2003*). Title I: Characteristics of tests will influence expenses; information sharing may help states realize efficiencies*. Washington, D.C.: Author.

Goals 2000: *Educate America Act*. (1994). H.R. 1804, 102nd Cong., 2d Sess.

Goetz, M.E. *The federal role in defining "Adequate Yearly Progress:" The flexibility/Accountability tradeoff*. Paper prepared for the Consortium for Policy Research in Education. University of Pennsylvania.

Goodlad, J. (1984). *A placed called school: Prospects for the future*. New York: McGraw Hill.

Grissmer, D. (2000). *Improving student achievement: What NAEP state test score tell us*. Santa Monica, CA: RAND Corporation.

Grissmer, D. (1994). *Student achievement and the changing American family*. SantaMonica, CA: RAND Corporation.

Hampel, R. ((2002). Historical perspectives on small schools. *Phi Delta Kappan 83*(5).

Hanushek, E. & Raymond, M. (2003). Lessons about accountability systems. In P. Peterson & M. West (Eds.). *No Child Left Behind?* (pp.127-148). Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institute Press.

Hardy, L. (2003). High goals: High task. *American School Board Journal*. September, 2003.

Horn, R.A. (2002). *Understanding educational reform*. Santa Barbara, CA: ABC-CLIO, Inc.

House Committee Conference Report, *No Child Left Behind Act of 2001*, 107th Congress, 1st sess., 2001, H-Report 107-334, 17-200.

House Committee on Education and Labor Hearings on H.R. 6, *Reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965*, 103d Congress, 1st sess., 1993., 1993 H-Report 103-65, 52-53.

Jaeger, R. (1984). *Sampling in Education and the Social Sciences*. New York: Longman Publishing.

Jennings, J. (2000). Its legislative history and its promises, *Phi Delta Kappan 81*, 516-520.

Jennings, J.F. (2002). *From the capitol to the classroom*. Washington, D.C.: Center for Education Policy.

Jennings, J.F. (2000). Title I: A success. *Education Week,* January 26, 2000.

Johnson, L.B. (1964). *Great society speech*. Retrieved on August 10, 2003 from http://courseas.matrix.msu.edu/~hst306/documents/great.html

Johnson, L.B. (1965). The war on poverty. In D. Schugrensky (Eds.). *History of education: Selected moments of the 20th Century*. Retrieved on November 7, 2003 from http://fcis.oise.utoronto.ca/`daniel_schurensky/citation/html

Jordan, K.F., & McKeown, M. (1980). State fiscal policy and educational reform. In J. Murphy (Ed.), *The educational reform movement of the 1980's: Perspectives and cases*, pp. 97-120. Berkley, CA: McCutchan Publishing Company.

Kachris, P. (2001). *Letter to Representative John Boehner*, Committee of Education and the Workforce, U.S. House of Representatives. National Rural Education Association.

Kaplan, L., & Owings, W. (2003). No Child Left Behind: The politics of teacher quality. *Phi Delta Kappan*, May 2003, pp. 687-692.

Karp, C. (2001). NCLB selective vision of equality: some gaps count more than others. In G. Wood & D. Meirer (Ed.). *Many children left behind*. (pp. 53-65). Boston, MA: Beacon Press.

Karson, S.M. (1991). *The recovery of American education: Reclaiming a vision*. New York, NY: University Press of America.

Keegan, L.G., Orr, B.J. & Jones, B.J. (2002). *Adequate Yearly Progress: Results and process*. Paper prepared for the Education Leadership Council.

Keller, B. (1997). *Quality counts '97: Oklahoma summary*. Retrieved on August 2, 2004 from www.edweek.org/sreports/qc97/states.ok.htm

Kennedy, M., Jung, R. & Orlando, M. (1986). *The effectiveness of Chapter I services: National assessment of Chapter I*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Education.

Lagowski, J. (1996). The education summit: A different signal. *Journal of Chemical Education*, *11*, 383.

Lau v. Nichols, 414 US 563 (1974).

Linn, R.L. (2000). Assessment and accountability. *Educational Researcher, 23*(9),4-16.

Linn, R. L., Baker, E.L., & Betebenner, D.W. (2002). Accountability systems: Implications of requirements of the no child left behind act of 2001. *Educational Researcher 31*(6), 3-16.

Mathis, W.J. (2003). No Child Left Behind: Cost and benefits. *Phi Delta Kappan*, *84*, May, p.679-686.

Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A.M. (1994). *An expanded sourcebook. Qualitative data analysis*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publishing.

Mintrop, H. (2004). *Schools on probation: How accountability works and doesn't work.* New York, NY: Columbia University.

Moe, T. (2003). Politic, control, and the future of school accountability. In

P. Peterson & M. West (Eds.). *No Child Left Behind?* (pp.80-103). Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institute Press.

National Commission for Excellence in Education (1983.) *A nation at risk: The imperative for educational reform*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Education.

National Conference of State Legislatures. (2003). *Education related legislative tracking database.* Retrieved October 3, 2003, from www.ncls.org/programs/educ/educ_leg_srch.cfm

Neil, M. (2004). *Leaving No Child Left Behind: overhaul NCLB.* Boston, MA: Beacon Press.

No Child Left Behind Act of 2001, Pub. L. No. 107-110, 115 Stat. 1425 (2002).

North Central Regional Educational Laboratory. (2004). *Implementing the No Child Left Behind Act: Implications for rural schools and districts.* Retrieved on March 20, 2004 from http://www.ncrel.org/policy/pubs/htm/implicate/challenge.htm

North Carolina State Department of Instructions. (2002). *ABC Plan*. Raleigh, N.C.: Author

Oakes, J., Quartz, K., Ryan, S., & Lipton, M. (2000). *Becoming Good American Schools.* San Francisco, CA.: Jossey-Bass, Inc.

Oklahoma. (1989). Task Force 2000 Report, *Blueprint for Excellence*.

Oklahoma Congress. (1990). House. *Oklahoma Omnibus Education Reform Act*. Cong, sess., 1990. H.B. 1017.

Oklahoma Office of Accountability. (1999). *Profiles 1999 state report*. Oklahoma City, OK: Author

Oklahoma Office of Accountability. (2000). *Profiles 2000 state report*. Oklahoma City, OK: Author

Oklahoma Office of Accountability. (2001). *Profiles 2001 state report*. Oklahoma City, OK: Author

Oklahoma Office of Accountability. (2002). *Profiles 2002w state report*. Oklahoma City, OK: Author

Oklahoma State Department of Education. (2004). *Investing in Oklahoma.* Retrieved on October 6, 2004 from www.sde.ok.us/publ/investing/factsfinances.html

Oklahoma State Department of Education. (2004). *Oklahoma's public schools meeting higher accountability standards for reading and math.* News Release, September 17, 2004.

Oklahoma State Department of Education. (2003). *Reauthorization of the elementary and secondary education act, No Child Left Behind guide.* Oklahoma City, OK.

Oklahoma State Department of Education. (2003). *State of Oklahoma consolidated state application accountability workbook*. Oklahoma City, OK.: Author

Olson, L. "Finding the Right Mix," *Education Week*, January 11, 2001, 12-20.

Olson, L. (2003). Approval of states' ESEA plans suggests flexibility. *Education Week,* January 22, 2003. Retrieved on April 13, 2003 from http://www.educationweek.org/ew/ewstory.cfm?slug+19account.h22

Paige, R. (2003). *Memo to members of Congress regarding No Child Left behind Update.*

Retrieved August 23, 2003, from http://www.ed.gov/PressRelease.07-2--3/07082003a.html

Peterson, P., & West, M. (2003). *No child left behind? The politics and practices of school accountability.* Washington, .D.C.: Brookings Institution Press

Puma, M., & Drury, D. (2000). *Title I in perspective.* National School Board Association. Retrieved on June 13, 2003 from http://www.nsba.org/bookreports/titleI/index/htm.

Ravitch, D. (1995). *National standards in American education: A citizen's guide*. Brookings Institute. 64-70.

Ravitch, D. (1985). *The schools we deserve: Reflections on the education crisis of our time.* New York, NY: Harper Collins.

Rea, L.M. & Parker, R.A. (1997). *Designing and conducting survey research*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publisher.

Rees, N. (2001). Time to overhaul the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. *Education Week*, October 10, 2001.

Reid, S. (1987). *Working with statistics: An introduction to quantitative methods for social scientists.* Totowa, N.J.: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.

Renner, T. (1988). *Statistics unraveled: A practical guide to using data in decision making.* Washington, D.C.: International City Management Association.

Robelen, E. (1999). Title I study finds promising student gains. *Education Week*, March 10, 1999.

Rose, L.C., & Gallup, A.M. (2003, September). The 35th annual Phi Delta Kappa/Gallup poll of the public's attitudes toward the public schools. *Phi Delta Kappan.*

San Antonio Independent School District v. Rodriquez, 411 U.S.1. (1973).

Sanders, T. (2003). Clearing the NCLB hurdle. *American School Board Journal.* September, 2003.

Rotherham, A. & Mead, S. (2003). Teacher quality: Beyond no child left behind. A response to Kaplan and Owenings (2002). *NASSP Bulletin*, 87, 64-69.

Sandia National Laboratories. (1993). Perspectives on education in America. *Journal of Educational Research, 86*, 259-310.

Serrano v. Priest. (1971). California Supreme Court (5 Cal. 3d 584, 487 P. 2d 1241) 1969, State Superior Court (dismissed) 1968 (filed).

Scheerens, J. (1992). *Effective Schooling: Research, Theory and Practice.* London: Cassell.

Seiden, R. *National Education Goals 2000: Some disastrous unintended consequences*. EPAA 11(1996).

Senate Committee on Labor and Human Resources. *Improving America's Schools Act of 1994*, 103d Congress, 2d. sess. 1994. S. Report 103-292 67-76.

Shawnee News Star. (1999). As 10th anniversary nears, merits of HB 1017 still debated. Retrieved November 29, 2004 from http://www.news-star.com/stories/052399/new_hb1017.shtml

Simon, R. (2004). *Decision letter on request to amend Oklahoma accountability plan*. Retrieved on December 29, 2004 from www.ed.gov/admins/lead/account/letters/acok2.html

Singham, M. (2003). The achievement gap: Myths and reality. *Phi Delta Kappan, 84* (8), 586-592.

Southwest Educational Development Laboratory. (n.d.).*Oklahoma Landscape*. Retrieved November 29,2004 from http://www.sedl.org/scimast/resources/landscape/ok/context/recent_history.html

Stecher, B., & Kirby, S. (2004). *Organizational improvement and accountability.* Santa Monica, CA: RAND.

Stone, J.E. (2001). *Improving teacher quality in Oklahoma: A closer look*. Oklahoma Council Of Public Affairs Inc. October, 2001.w Oklahoma City, OK.

Sunderman, G.L. (2001). Accountability mandates and the implementation of Title I schoolwide programs: A comparison of three urban districts. *Education Administration Quarterly*, *37*(4) 503-532.

Sunderman, G.L., & Kim, J. (2004). *Expansion of federal power in American Education: federal-state relations under the No Child Left Behind Act, year one*. Cambridge, MA: The Civil Rights Project at Harvard University.

The White House. (2001). *No Child Left Behind*. Washington, D.C.: The White House.

Thrupp, M. (1999). *Schools making a difference: Let's be realistic*. Philadelphia, PA: Open University Press.

U.S. Department of Education. (2002). *ESEA Title I allocations for fiscal year 2002*. Retrieved April 19, 2003 from www.ed./gov/offices/OUS/TitleILEAs?FY02allocations/index/html

U.S. House of Representative. *No Child Left Behind: Communication from the President of the United States*. 107th Congress, 1 sess. House Document 107-34. Washington, D.C. 2001.

Vermont Society for the Study of Education. (2002, October). *The Federal "No Child Left Behind" law Should Vermont take the money?,* From www.aasa.org/issues_and_insights/ESEA/VT_NCLB_cost-benefit_analysis_10-22.pdf

Vinovski, M. (1999). Do federal compensatory programs really work? A brief historical perspective of title I and head start. *American Journal of Education*, 107, 187-209.

Wood, G. (2004). A view from the field: NCLB's effect on classrooms and schools. In G.Wood & D. Meier (Eds.). *Many children left behind.* (pp.35-50). Boston, MA: Beacon Press.

Wagner, R. (1989). *Accountability in education.* New York, NY: Routledge.

Zehr, M. (2000). Ed. Department warns states to comply with Title I rules. *Education Week*, November 22, 2000.Retrieved on April 13, 2003 from http://www.educationweek.org/ew/ewstory/cfm?slug=12title.h20.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

Comprehensive No Child Left Behind Reform Questionnaire
Winter 2005

Professional Background Information

Directions: Please respond to each question by placing your answer at the end of each question on the blank provided or by circling the appropriate response.

1. Your title: (Circle only one)
   Certified Classroom Teacher Building Level Principal/Assistant Principal
2. In your current position, how many total years have you been employed?_____
3. What are the grade levels served by your school?_____
4. How is your school classified? (circle one) Title I Non-Title 1
5. Is your school currently under a "Plan of Improvement"? (Circle only one) Yes No

Understanding of the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001

Directions: Circle your response.

(SA=Strongly Agree A= Agree D= Disagree SD= Strongly Disagree)

6.	I understand the meaning of accountability under Title I of the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB).	SA	A	D	SD
7.	I understand the meaning of Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) under NCLB.	SA	A	D	SD
8.	I understand the meaning of statewide assessments under NCLB.	SA	A	D	SD
9.	I understand the consequences of schools that fails to make AYP?	SA	A	D	SD
10.	I understand the consequences for teachers whose students fail to make AYP under NCLB.	SA	A	D	SD
11.	I understand the consequences for building level principals whose school fails to make AYP.	SA	A	D	SD
12.	I understand the consequences for schools if students fail to achieve 100% proficiency in reading, math and science by 2013-2014	SA	A	D	SD
13.	I understand the rights of parents if the school that their child is attending is identified as in need of improvement.	SA	A	D	SD

14.	1 understand that annual report cards are to be provided to parents from Title I schools only.	SA	A	D	SD
15.	1 am aware that 95% of each subgroup must take the state wide assessment under NCLB.	SA	A	D	SD
16.	1 am aware that assessment data will be disaggregated by the major subgroups.	SA	A	D	SD
17.	1 understand the required qualifications of educators, new and not new, under NCLB.	SA	A	D	SD
18.	1 understand Oklahoma's educational accountability system.	SA	A	D	SD

Instructional Implications of No Child Left Behind

19.	NCLB will benefit schools with multiple subgroups.	SA	A	D	SD
20.	All children can meet the goals of NCLB regardless of their socioeconomic status.	SA	A	D	SD
21.	All children can meet the goals of NCLB regardless of their disability.	SA	A	D	SD
22.	All children can meet the goals of NCLB regardless of their race and ethnicity.	SA	A	D	SD
23.	All children can meet the goals of NCLB regardless of language barriers.	SA	A	D	SD
24.	All children can meet the goals of NCLB regardless of parental support.	SA	A	D	SD
25.	NCLB has substantially altered teaching practices.	SA	A	D	SD
26.	NCLB has increased reliance on textbooks, workbooks, and worksheets more than they use to for basic skills or content area instructions.	SA	A	D	SD
27.	Disadvantaged children will be positively impacted by NCLB.	SA	A	D	SD
28.	Because of NCLB diverse schools will have a higher chance of being labeled, " in need of improvement."	SA	A	D	SD
29.	Because of NCLB, even in successful schools some students are more likely to lag behind.	SA	A	D	SD

30.	NCLB adequately addresses the needs of disadvantaged children.	SA	A	D	SD
31.	NCLB adequately addresses the needs of high performing students.	SA	A	D	SD
32.	Because of NCLB, educators in this school spend more time working together to develop curriculum and plan instructions.	SA	A	D	SD
33.	Because NCLB focus schools on skills such as mathematics and reading, time devoted to other subjects have been reduced.	SA	A	D	SD
34.	Educators in my school are generally supportive of NCLB.	SA	A	D	SD
35.	As a school staff, we review and analyze our test data to determine adequate yearly progress (AYP).	SA	A	D	SD
36.	NCLB is an "all or nothing way" at holding schools accountable.	SA	A	D	SD
37.	NCLB deals exclusively with Title 1 schools.	SA	A	D	SD
38.	Because of NCLB, educators will teach to the test.	SA	A	D	SD
39.	The same academic performance standards should apply to all students.	SA	A	D	SD
40.	Because of NCLB, more attention is given to state-dictated curricula and content.	SA	A	D	SD
41.	Because of NCLB, an emphasis on test scores may have a variety of negative consequences.	SA	A	D	SD

Funding Implications of No Child Left Behind

42.	NCLB adequately addresses the funding inequalities between advantaged and disadvantaged schools.	SA	A	D	SD
43.	Federal funding of NCLB is adequate.	SA	A	D	SD
44.	State and local school funding systems are adequate to meet the goals of NCLB.	SA	A	D	SD
45.	NCLB will lead to further reductions in federal dollars for schools failing to make adequate yearly progress.	SA	A	D	SD
46.	NCLB has funding disparities that will affect the education by low-income children.	SA	A	D	SD
47.	Funding mechanisms of Title I under NCLB is an improvement over previous Title I funding mechanisms.	SA	A	D	SD

APPENDIX B

Comprehensive No Child Left Behind Reform Questionnaire

CNCLBRQ

Contact Information

Name: S. Kirk
Address: 2009 S. Post Rd. Midwest City, Oklahoma 73130
Voice: 405-739-1726
Fax: 405-739-1685
Email: s_kirk9128@sbcglobal.net

1. Professional Background Information

[Top] [Professional Backround] [Understanding of NCLB] [Perceived Implications] [Submit]

Please respond to each question.

1.1. What is your current title?

- ☐ Certified Classroom Teacher
- ☐ Building Level Principal/Assistant Principal

1.2. In your current position, how many years have you been employed?

1.3. What are the grade levels served by your school?

1.4. How is your school classified?

- ☐ Title I
- ☐ Non-Title I

1.5. Is your school currently under a "Plan of Improvement"?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No

2. Understanding of the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001

[Top] [Professional Backround] [Understanding of NCLB] [Perceived Implications] [Submit]

SA=Strongly Agree A=Agree D=Disagree SD=Strongly Disagree

2.1. I understand the meaning of accountability under Title I of the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB).

- ☐ SA
- ☐ A
- ☐ D
- ☐ SD

2.2. I understand the meaning of Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) under NCLB.

- ☐ SA
- ☐ A
- ☐ D
- ☐ SD

2.3. I understand the meaning of statewide assessments under NCLB.

- ☐ SA
- ☐ A
- ☐ D
- ☐ SD

2.4. I understand the consequences to schools and districts that fail to make AYP.

- ☐ SA
- ☐ A
- ☐ D
- ☐ SD

2.5. I understand the consequences for teachers whose students fail to make AYP under NCLB.

- ☐ SA
- ☐ A
- ☐ D
- ☐ SD

2.6. I understand the consequences to building level principals whose school fails to make AYP.

- ☐ SA
- ☐ A
- ☐ D
- ☐ SD

2.7. I understand the consequences for schools if their students fail to achieve 100% proficiency in reading/language arts, math and science by 2013-2014.

- ☐ SA
- ☐ A
- ☐ D
- ☐ SD

2.8. I understand the rights of parents if the school that their child is attending is identified as in need of improvement.

- ☐ SA
- ☐ A
- ☐ D
- ☐ SD

2.9. I understand that annual report cards are to be provided to parents from Title I schools only.

- ☐ SA
- ☐ A
- ☐ D
- ☐ SD

2.10. I am aware that 95% of each major subgroup must take the same statewide assessments under NCLB.

- ☐ SA
- ☐ A

- D
- SD

2.11. I am aware that assessment data will be disaggregated by the major subgroups.

- SA
- A
- D
- SD

2.12. I understand the required qualifications of educators, new and not new, under NCLB.

- SA
- A
- D
- SD

2.13. I understand the goals of NCLB.

- SA
- A
- D
- SD

2.14. I understand the correlation between Academic Performance Index (API),Oklahoma's educational accountability system, and Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP).

- SA
- A
- D
- SD

3. Perceived Implications of the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001

[Top] [Professional Backround] [Understanding of NCLB] [Perceived Implications] [Submit]

Please respond to every question. SA=Strongly Agree A=Agree D=Disagree SD= Strongly Disagree

3.1. NCLB will benefit schools with multiple subgroups.

- SA
- A
- D
- SD

3.2. All children can meet the goals of NCLB regardless of their socioeconomic status.

- SA
- A
- D
- SD

3.3. All children can meet the goals of NCLB regardless of their disability.

- ☐ SA
- ☐ A
- ☐ D
- ☐ SD

3.4. All children can meet the goals of NCLB regardless of their race and ethnicity.

- ☐ SA
- ☐ A
- ☐ D
- ☐ SD

3.5. All children can meet the goals of NCLB regardless of their proficiency in English.

- ☐ SA
- ☐ A
- ☐ D
- ☐ SD

3.6. All children can meet the goals of NCLB regardless of parental support.

- ☐ SA
- ☐ A
- ☐ D
- ☐ SD

3.7. NCLB has substantially altered teaching practices.

- ☐ SA
- ☐ A
- ☐ D
- ☐ SD

3.8. NCLB has increased reliance on textbooks, workbooks, and worksheets more than they use to for basic skills or content area instruction.

- ☐ SA
- ☐ A
- ☐ D
- ☐ SD

3.9. Disadvantaged children will be positively impacted by NCLB.

- ☐ SA
- ☐ A
- ☐ D
- ☐ SD

3.10. Special Education students will encounter greater difficulty than regular education students in meeting the goals of NCLB.

- ☐ SA
- ☐ A

- D
- SD

3.11. Because of NCLB, educators in this school spend more time working together to develop curriculum and plan instruction.

- SA
- A
- D
- SD

3.12. Because NCLB focus schools on skills such as mathematics and reading, time devoted to other subjects has been reduced.

- SA
- A
- D
- SD

3.13. Educators in my school are supportive of NCLB.

- SA
- A
- D
- SD

3.14. NCLB will have a positive impact upon Title I schools?

- SA

- A
- D
- SD

3.15. Non-Title I schools are held to the same standards as Title I schools under NCLB.

- SA
- A
- D
- SD

3.16. Because of NCLB, educators will teach to the test.

- SA
- A
- D
- SD

3.17. The same academic performance standards should apply for all students.

- SA
- A
- D
- SD

3.18. Because of NCLB, more attention is given to state-dictated curricula and

content.

- ☐ SA
- ☐ A
- ☐ D
- ☐ SD

3.19. Federal funding of NCLB is adequate.

- ☐ SA
- ☐ A
- ☐ D
- ☐ SD

3.20. State and local funding systems are adequate to meet the goals of NCLB.

- ☐ SA
- ☐ A
- ☐ D
- ☐ SD

3.21. Funding mechanisms of Title I under NCLB are an improvement over previous Title I funding mechanisms.

- ☐ SA
- ☐ A
- ☐ D

☐ SD

Submit Survey Responses

This survey was created using the
SurveySuite Survey Generation Tool
by

APPENDIX C

Preliminary Results of Cronbach's Alpha

Understanding of the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001

	Scale Mean if Item Deleted	Scale Variance if Item Deleted	Corrected Item-Total Correlation	Alpha if Item Deleted
Q_1	36.5349	39.2547	.6365	.9067
Q_2	36.4419	39.4430	.7158	.9047
Q_3	36.3721	39.2392	.7215	.9043
Q_4	36.4419	39.2049	.6480	.9063
Q5	37.0930	39.2292	.4495	.9157
Q6	36.8605	38.2182	.6234	.9071
Q7	37.0930	38.1340	.5584	.9106
Q8	36.6512	37.6135	.6791	.9047
Q9	37.2093	38.9790	.5270	.9113
Q10	36.4651	39.2547	.6495	.9063
Q11	36.5349	38.3499	.7115	.9037
Q12	36.6047	37.5781	.7254	.9027
Q13	36.9070	35.8959	.7956	.8992

Reliability Coefficients

N of Cases = 43.0 N of Items = 13

Alpha = .9130

Cronbach's Alphas

Implications of the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001

	Scale Mean if Item Deleted	Scale Variance if Item Deleted	Corrected Item-Total Correlation	Alpha if Item Deleted
Q14	67.3864	25.5449	.5252	.5718
Q15	67.6364	24.9345	.5661	.5636
Q16	68.0682	27.5534	.3112	.5998
Q17	67.2500	23.9593	.6041	.5516
Q18	67.8182	26.2452	.5303	.5782
Q19	67.7727	25.7146	.4457	.5788
Q20	66.7727	27.5751	.2163	.6080
Q21	66.8864	26.6147	.4074	.5878
Q22	67.5455	25.9746	.4748	.5787
Q23	66.4318	31.1813	-.2439	.6535
Q24	66.5455	32.2072	-.3758	.6659
Q25	67.7500	26.9826	.3718	.5926
Q26	67.4545	28.8584	.0242	.6337
Q27	66.9545	27.3002	.2901	.6001
Q28	66.6364	28.8879	.0801	.6217
Q29	67.6591	26.8811	.3515	.5933
Q30	66.3636	29.8182	-.0518	.6324
Q31	66.5455	31.1839	-.2434	.6537
Q32	67.8182	28.7104	.1565	.6142
Q33	66.5455	28.2072	.1534	.6149
Q34	67.7500	26.8430	.3663	.5920
Q35	66.3182	27.8034	.3278	.6005
Q36	66.2727	31.5053	-.3142	.6538
Q37	67.9545	29.5793	-.0127	.6289
Q38	68.0909	28.9683	.0937	.6195
Q39	68.1364	28.2600	.2161	.6091
Q40	66.5227	30.2088	-.1214	.6324
Q41	66.5682	30.7627	-.2196	.6415
Q42	67.7273	28.9471	.1748	.6138

Reliability Coefficients

N of Cases = 44.0 N of Items = 29

Alpha = .6202

Adjusted Cronbach Alphas

Implications of the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001

R E L I A B I L I T Y A N A L Y S I S - S C A L E (A L P H A)

Item-total Statistics

	Scale Mean if Item Deleted	Scale Variance if Item Deleted	Corrected Item-Total Correlation	Alpha if Item Deleted
Q14	43.6818	35.1057	.6636	.7897
Q15	43.9318	34.7627	.6517	.7894
Q16	44.3636	37.3996	.4797	.8014
Q17	43.5455	33.5095	.6932	.7848
Q18	44.1136	36.2426	.6442	.7935
Q19	44.0682	35.0883	.5995	.7925
Q20	43.0682	39.5069	.1215	.8203
Q21	43.1818	38.6638	.2561	.8120
Q22	43.8409	35.9974	.5656	.7956
Q25	44.0455	36.8816	.5105	.7994
Q26	43.7500	38.1919	.2130	.8175
Q27	43.2500	38.6570	.2461	.8127
Q28	42.9318	41.4604	-.0809	.8272
Q29	43.9545	36.1839	.5563	.7963
Q32	44.1136	40.2426	.1081	.8168
Q33	42.8409	40.6485	.0077	.8250
Q34	44.0455	36.3235	.5504	.7968
Q35	42.6136	40.1961	.1154	.8166
Q38	44.3864	39.5914	.1891	.8141
Q39	44.4318	38.4371	.3614	.8069
Q42	44.0227	38.9995	.4248	.8064

Reliability Coefficients

N of Cases = 44.0 N of Items = 21

Alpha = .8137

Descriptive Statistics of Educators' Understanding of NCLB

Group Statistics

	POSITION	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Q1	Princpl	47	3.17	.732	.107
	Teacher	84	2.94	.717	.078
Q2	Princpl	47	3.23	.729	.106
	Teacher	84	3.02	.711	.078
Q3	Princpl	46	3.33	.598	.088
	Teacher	84	3.04	.685	.075
Q4	Princpl	46	3.15	.759	.112
	Teacher	83	3.00	.698	.077
Q5	Princpl	47	2.72	.743	.108
	Teacher	84	2.56	.883	.096
Q6	Princpl	46	2.87	.859	.127
	Teacher	85	2.53	.825	.089
Q7	Princpl	47	2.66	.867	.126
	Teacher	85	2.53	.881	.096
Q8	Princpl	47	3.17	.564	.082
	Teacher	85	2.89	.787	.085
Q9	Princpl	47	2.53	.905	.132
	Teacher	85	2.53	.749	.081
Q10	Princpl	47	3.19	.798	.116
	Teacher	85	2.88	.793	.086
Q11	Princpl	47	3.30	.778	.113
	Teacher	85	2.96	.823	.089
Q12	Princpl	47	3.17	.761	.111
	Teacher	85	2.87	.768	.083
Q13	Princpl	47	3.04	.779	.114
	Teacher	84	2.73	.734	.080
Q14	Princpl	47	2.98	.766	.112
	Teacher	85	2.65	.797	.086

Independent Samples Test

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
									95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	Lower	Upper
Q1	Equal variances assumed	.611	.436	1.746	129	.083	.23	.132	-.031	.490
	Equal variances not assumed			1.736	93.728	.086	.23	.132	-.033	.493
Q2	Equal variances assumed	2.420	.122	1.609	129	.110	.21	.131	-.048	.469
	Equal variances not assumed			1.598	93.370	.113	.21	.132	-.051	.472
Q3	Equal variances assumed	1.206	.274	2.415	128	.017	.29	.120	.052	.528
	Equal variances not assumed			2.512	103.738	.014	.29	.116	.061	.520
Q4	Equal variances assumed	1.473	.227	1.149	127	.253	.15	.132	-.110	.414
	Equal variances not assumed			1.122	86.656	.265	.15	.136	-.117	.422
Q5	Equal variances assumed	2.819	.096	1.076	129	.284	.16	.152	-.137	.465
	Equal variances not assumed			1.130	109.500	.261	.16	.145	-.124	.451
Q6	Equal variances assumed	.067	.796	2.220	129	.028	.34	.153	.037	.643
	Equal variances not assumed			2.193	89.216	.031	.34	.155	.032	.648
Q7	Equal variances assumed	.099	.753	.818	130	.415	.13	.159	-.185	.445
	Equal variances not assumed			.821	96.342	.413	.13	.158	-.184	.445
Q8	Equal variances assumed	3.137	.079	2.121	130	.036	.28	.130	.019	.534
	Equal variances not assumed			2.328	121.345	.022	.28	.119	.041	.511
Q9	Equal variances assumed	3.119	.080	.017	130	.986	.00	.147	-.288	.293
	Equal variances not assumed			.016	81.087	.987	.00	.155	-.306	.311
Q10	Equal variances assumed	.083	.774	2.140	130	.034	.31	.144	.023	.595
	Equal variances not assumed			2.136	94.540	.035	.31	.145	.022	.596
Q11	Equal variances assumed	.319	.573	2.270	130	.025	.33	.147	.043	.623
	Equal variances not assumed			2.308	99.664	.023	.33	.144	.047	.620
Q12	Equal variances assumed	.038	.845	2.153	130	.033	.30	.139	.024	.575
	Equal variances not assumed			2.159	95.795	.033	.30	.139	.024	.575
Q13	Equal variances assumed	.098	.755	2.315	129	.022	.32	.137	.046	.587
	Equal variances not assumed			2.276	90.641	.025	.32	.139	.040	.593
Q14	Equal variances assumed	2.443	.121	2.320	130	.022	.33	.143	.049	.614
	Equal variances not assumed			2.348	98.332	.021	.33	.141	.051	.612

Q1 * POSITION Crosstabulation

			POSITION			
				Princpl	Teacher	Total
Q1	1	Count		2	4	6
		% within POSITION		4.3%	4.8%	4.5%
	2	Count		3	12	15
		% within POSITION		6.4%	14.3%	11.4%
	3	Count	1	27	53	81
		% within POSITION	100.0%	57.4%	63.1%	61.4%
	4	Count		15	15	30
		% within POSITION		31.9%	17.9%	22.7%
Total		Count	1	47	84	132
		% within POSITION	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Q2 * POSITION Crosstabulation

			POSITION			
				Princpl	Teacher	Total
Q2	1	Count		1	3	4
		% within POSITION		2.1%	3.6%	3.0%
	2	Count	1	5	11	17
		% within POSITION	100.0%	10.6%	13.1%	12.9%
	3	Count		23	51	74
		% within POSITION		48.9%	60.7%	56.1%
	4	Count		18	19	37
		% within POSITION		38.3%	22.6%	28.0%
Total		Count	1	47	84	132
		% within POSITION	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Q3 * POSITION Crosstabulation

			POSITION			
				Princpl	Teacher	Total
Q3	1	Count			2	2
		% within POSITION			2.4%	1.5%
	2	Count		3	12	15
		% within POSITION		6.5%	14.3%	11.5%
	3	Count	1	25	51	77
		% within POSITION	100.0%	54.3%	60.7%	58.8%
	4	Count		18	19	37
		% within POSITION		39.1%	22.6%	28.2%
Total		Count	1	46	84	131
		% within POSITION	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Q4 * POSITION Crosstabulation

			POSITION			Total
				Princpl	Teacher	
Q4	1	Count		2	2	4
		% within POSITION		4.3%	2.4%	3.1%
	2	Count		4	14	18
		% within POSITION		8.7%	16.9%	13.8%
	3	Count	1	25	49	75
		% within POSITION	100.0%	54.3%	59.0%	57.7%
	4	Count		15	18	33
		% within POSITION		32.6%	21.7%	25.4%
Total		Count	1	46	83	130
		% within POSITION	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Q5 * POSITION Crosstabulation

			POSITION			Total
				Princpl	Teacher	
Q5	1	Count		1	10	11
		% within POSITION		2.1%	11.9%	8.3%
	2	Count	1	18	29	48
		% within POSITION	100.0%	38.3%	34.5%	36.4%
	3	Count		21	33	54
		% within POSITION		44.7%	39.3%	40.9%
	4	Count		7	12	19
		% within POSITION		14.9%	14.3%	14.4%
Total		Count	1	47	84	132
		% within POSITION	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Q6 * POSITION Crosstabulation

			POSITION			Total
				Princpl	Teacher	
Q6	1	Count		2	7	9
		% within POSITION		4.3%	8.2%	6.8%
	2	Count	1	14	37	52
		% within POSITION	100.0%	30.4%	43.5%	39.4%
	3	Count		18	30	48
		% within POSITION		39.1%	35.3%	36.4%
	4	Count		12	11	23
		% within POSITION		26.1%	12.9%	17.4%
Total		Count	1	46	85	132
		% within POSITION	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Q7 * POSITION Crosstabulation

			POSITION			
				Princpl	Teacher	Total
Q7	1	Count		4	11	15
		% within POSITION		8.5%	12.9%	11.3%
	2	Count		16	29	45
		% within POSITION		34.0%	34.1%	33.8%
	3	Count	1	19	34	54
		% within POSITION	100.0%	40.4%	40.0%	40.6%
	4	Count		8	11	19
		% within POSITION		17.0%	12.9%	14.3%
Total		Count	1	47	85	133
		% within POSITION	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Q8 * POSITION Crosstabulation

			POSITION			
				Princpl	Teacher	Total
Q8	1	Count			4	4
		% within POSITION			4.7%	3.0%
	2	Count	1	4	19	24
		% within POSITION	100.0%	8.5%	22.4%	18.0%
	3	Count		31	44	75
		% within POSITION		66.0%	51.8%	56.4%
	4	Count		12	18	30
		% within POSITION		25.5%	21.2%	22.6%
Total		Count	1	47	85	133
		% within POSITION	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Q9 * POSITION Crosstabulation

			POSITION			
				Princpl	Teacher	Total
Q9	1	Count		5	6	11
		% within POSITION		10.6%	7.1%	8.3%
	2	Count	1	20	35	56
		% within POSITION	100.0%	42.6%	41.2%	42.1%
	3	Count		14	37	51
		% within POSITION		29.8%	43.5%	38.3%
	4	Count		8	7	15
		% within POSITION		17.0%	8.2%	11.3%
Total		Count	1	47	85	133
		% within POSITION	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Q10 * POSITION Crosstabulation

			POSITION			Total
				Princpl	Teacher	
Q10	1	Count		2	4	6
		% within POSITION		4.3%	4.7%	4.5%
	2	Count		5	20	25
		% within POSITION		10.6%	23.5%	18.8%
	3	Count	1	22	43	66
		% within POSITION	100.0%	46.8%	50.6%	49.6%
	4	Count		18	18	36
		% within POSITION		38.3%	21.2%	27.1%
Total		Count	1	47	85	133
		% within POSITION	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Q11 * POSITION Crosstabulation

			POSITION			Total
				Princpl	Teacher	
Q11	1	Count		2	5	7
		% within POSITION		4.3%	5.9%	5.3%
	2	Count		3	15	18
		% within POSITION		6.4%	17.6%	13.5%
	3	Count	1	21	43	65
		% within POSITION	100.0%	44.7%	50.6%	48.9%
	4	Count		21	22	43
		% within POSITION		44.7%	25.9%	32.3%
Total		Count	1	47	85	133
		% within POSITION	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Q12 * POSITION Crosstabulation

			POSITION			Total
				Princpl	Teacher	
Q12	1	Count		2	3	5
		% within POSITION		4.3%	3.5%	3.8%
	2	Count	1	4	22	27
		% within POSITION	100.0%	8.5%	25.9%	20.3%
	3	Count		25	43	68
		% within POSITION		53.2%	50.6%	51.1%
	4	Count		16	17	33
		% within POSITION		34.0%	20.0%	24.8%
Total		Count	1	47	85	133
		% within POSITION	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Q13 * POSITION Crosstabulation

			POSITION			Total
				Princpl	Teacher	
Q13	1	Count		1	4	5
		% within POSITION		2.1%	4.8%	3.8%
	2	Count	1	10	25	36
		% within POSITION	100.0%	21.3%	29.8%	27.3%
	3	Count		22	45	67
		% within POSITION		46.8%	53.6%	50.8%
	4	Count		14	10	24
		% within POSITION		29.8%	11.9%	18.2%
Total		Count	1	47	84	132
		% within POSITION	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Q14 * POSITION Crosstabulation

			POSITION			Total
				Princpl	Teacher	
Q14	1	Count		1	6	7
		% within POSITION		2.1%	7.1%	5.3%
	2	Count	1	11	29	41
		% within POSITION	100.0%	23.4%	34.1%	30.8%
	3	Count		23	39	62
		% within POSITION		48.9%	45.9%	46.6%
	4	Count		12	11	23
		% within POSITION		25.5%	12.9%	17.3%
Total		Count	1	47	85	133
		% within POSITION	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Frequencies of Educators' Understanding of NCLB

Case Processing Summary

	Cases					
	Valid		Missing		Total	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
POSITION * Q1	132	97.8%	3	2.2%	135	100.0%
POSITION * Q2	132	97.8%	3	2.2%	135	100.0%
POSITION * Q3	131	97.0%	4	3.0%	135	100.0%
POSITION * Q4	130	96.3%	5	3.7%	135	100.0%
POSITION * Q5	132	97.8%	3	2.2%	135	100.0%
POSITION * Q6	132	97.8%	3	2.2%	135	100.0%
POSITION * Q7	133	98.5%	2	1.5%	135	100.0%
POSITION * Q8	133	98.5%	2	1.5%	135	100.0%
POSITION * Q9	133	98.5%	2	1.5%	135	100.0%
POSITION * Q10	133	98.5%	2	1.5%	135	100.0%
POSITION * Q11	133	98.5%	2	1.5%	135	100.0%
POSITION * Q12	133	98.5%	2	1.5%	135	100.0%
POSITION * Q13	132	97.8%	3	2.2%	135	100.0%
POSITION * Q14	133	98.5%	2	1.5%	135	100.0%

POSITION * Q1 Crosstabulation

			Q1				
			1	2	3	4	Total
POSITION		Count			1		1
		% within POSITION			100.0%		100.0%
	Princpl	Count	2	3	27	15	47
		% within POSITION	4.3%	6.4%	57.4%	31.9%	100.0%
	Teacher	Count	4	12	53	15	84
		% within POSITION	4.8%	14.3%	63.1%	17.9%	100.0%
Total		Count	6	15	81	30	132
		% within POSITION	4.5%	11.4%	61.4%	22.7%	100.0%

POSITION * Q2 Crosstabulation

			Q2				
			1	2	3	4	Total
POSITION		Count		1			1
		% within POSITION		100.0%			100.0%
	Princpl	Count	1	5	23	18	47
		% within POSITION	2.1%	10.6%	48.9%	38.3%	100.0%
	Teacher	Count	3	11	51	19	84
		% within POSITION	3.6%	13.1%	60.7%	22.6%	100.0%
Total		Count	4	17	74	37	132
		% within POSITION	3.0%	12.9%	56.1%	28.0%	100.0%

POSITION * Q3 Crosstabulation

			Q3				
			1	2	3	4	Total
POSITION		Count			1		1
		% within POSITION			100.0%		100.0%
	Princpl	Count		3	25	18	46
		% within POSITION		6.5%	54.3%	39.1%	100.0%
	Teacher	Count	2	12	51	19	84
		% within POSITION	2.4%	14.3%	60.7%	22.6%	100.0%
Total		Count	2	15	77	37	131
		% within POSITION	1.5%	11.5%	58.8%	28.2%	100.0%

POSITION * Q4 Crosstabulation

			Q4				
			1	2	3	4	Total
POSITION		Count			1		1
		% within POSITION			100.0%		100.0%
	Princpl	Count	2	4	25	15	46
		% within POSITION	4.3%	8.7%	54.3%	32.6%	100.0%
	Teacher	Count	2	14	49	18	83
		% within POSITION	2.4%	16.9%	59.0%	21.7%	100.0%
Total		Count	4	18	75	33	130
		% within POSITION	3.1%	13.8%	57.7%	25.4%	100.0%

POSITION * Q5 Crosstabulation

			Q5				
			1	2	3	4	Total
POSITION		Count		1			1
		% within POSITION		100.0%			100.0%
	Princpl	Count	1	18	21	7	47
		% within POSITION	2.1%	38.3%	44.7%	14.9%	100.0%
	Teacher	Count	10	29	33	12	84
		% within POSITION	11.9%	34.5%	39.3%	14.3%	100.0%
Total		Count	11	48	54	19	132
		% within POSITION	8.3%	36.4%	40.9%	14.4%	100.0%

POSITION * Q6 Crosstabulation

			Q6				
			1	2	3	4	Total
POSITION		Count		1			1
		% within POSITION		100.0%			100.0%
	Princpl	Count	2	14	18	12	46
		% within POSITION	4.3%	30.4%	39.1%	26.1%	100.0%
	Teacher	Count	7	37	30	11	85
		% within POSITION	8.2%	43.5%	35.3%	12.9%	100.0%
Total		Count	9	52	48	23	132
		% within POSITION	6.8%	39.4%	36.4%	17.4%	100.0%

POSITION * Q7 Crosstabulation

			Q7				
			1	2	3	4	Total
POSITION		Count			1		1
		% within POSITION			100.0%		100.0%
	Princpl	Count	4	16	19	8	47
		% within POSITION	8.5%	34.0%	40.4%	17.0%	100.0%
	Teacher	Count	11	29	34	11	85
		% within POSITION	12.9%	34.1%	40.0%	12.9%	100.0%
Total		Count	15	45	54	19	133
		% within POSITION	11.3%	33.8%	40.6%	14.3%	100.0%

POSITION * Q8 Crosstabulation

			Q8				
			1	2	3	4	Total
POSITION		Count		1			1
		% within POSITION		100.0%			100.0%
	Princpl	Count		4	31	12	47
		% within POSITION		8.5%	66.0%	25.5%	100.0%
	Teacher	Count	4	19	44	18	85
		% within POSITION	4.7%	22.4%	51.8%	21.2%	100.0%
Total		Count	4	24	75	30	133
		% within POSITION	3.0%	18.0%	56.4%	22.6%	100.0%

POSITION * Q9 Crosstabulation

			Q9				
			1	2	3	4	Total
POSITION		Count		1			1
		% within POSITION		100.0%			100.0%
	Princpl	Count	5	20	14	8	47
		% within POSITION	10.6%	42.6%	29.8%	17.0%	100.0%
	Teacher	Count	6	35	37	7	85
		% within POSITION	7.1%	41.2%	43.5%	8.2%	100.0%
Total		Count	11	56	51	15	133
		% within POSITION	8.3%	42.1%	38.3%	11.3%	100.0%

POSITION * Q10 Crosstabulation

			Q10				
			1	2	3	4	Total
POSITION		Count			1		1
		% within POSITION			100.0%		100.0%
	Princpl	Count	2	5	22	18	47
		% within POSITION	4.3%	10.6%	46.8%	38.3%	100.0%
	Teacher	Count	4	20	43	18	85
		% within POSITION	4.7%	23.5%	50.6%	21.2%	100.0%
Total		Count	6	25	66	36	133
		% within POSITION	4.5%	18.8%	49.6%	27.1%	100.0%

POSITION * Q11 Crosstabulation

			Q11				
			1	2	3	4	Total
POSITION		Count			1		1
		% within POSITION			100.0%		100.0%
	Princpl	Count	2	3	21	21	47
		% within POSITION	4.3%	6.4%	44.7%	44.7%	100.0%
	Teacher	Count	5	15	43	22	85
		% within POSITION	5.9%	17.6%	50.6%	25.9%	100.0%
Total		Count	7	18	65	43	133
		% within POSITION	5.3%	13.5%	48.9%	32.3%	100.0%

POSITION * Q12 Crosstabulation

			Q12				
			1	2	3	4	Total
POSITION		Count		1			1
		% within POSITION		100.0%			100.0%
	Princpl	Count	2	4	25	16	47
		% within POSITION	4.3%	8.5%	53.2%	34.0%	100.0%
	Teacher	Count	3	22	43	17	85
		% within POSITION	3.5%	25.9%	50.6%	20.0%	100.0%
Total		Count	5	27	68	33	133
		% within POSITION	3.8%	20.3%	51.1%	24.8%	100.0%

POSITION * Q13 Crosstabulation

			Q13				
			1	2	3	4	Total
POSITION		Count		1			1
		% within POSITION		100.0%			100.0%
	Princpl	Count	1	10	22	14	47
		% within POSITION	2.1%	21.3%	46.8%	29.8%	100.0%
	Teacher	Count	4	25	45	10	84
		% within POSITION	4.8%	29.8%	53.6%	11.9%	100.0%
Total		Count	5	36	67	24	132
		% within POSITION	3.8%	27.3%	50.8%	18.2%	100.0%

POSITION * Q14 Crosstabulation

			Q14				
			1	2	3	4	Total
POSITION		Count		1			1
		% within POSITION		100.0%			100.0%
	Princpl	Count	1	11	23	12	47
		% within POSITION	2.1%	23.4%	48.9%	25.5%	100.0%
	Teacher	Count	6	29	39	11	85
		% within POSITION	7.1%	34.1%	45.9%	12.9%	100.0%
Total		Count	7	41	62	23	133
		% within POSITION	5.3%	30.8%	46.6%	17.3%	100.0%

Descriptive Statistics of Title I and Non-Title I Educators Understanding of the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001

Group Statistics

	TYPE	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Q1	NonT1	49	2.88	.726	.104
	Title1	77	3.13	.695	.079
Q2	NonT1	48	3.10	.722	.104
	Title1	78	3.10	.713	.081
Q3	NonT1	48	3.08	.679	.098
	Title1	77	3.19	.629	.072
Q4	NonT1	48	2.96	.743	.107
	Title1	76	3.16	.654	.075
Q5	NonT1	48	2.58	.794	.115
	Title1	78	2.63	.854	.097
Q6	NonT1	49	2.59	.888	.127
	Title1	77	2.70	.828	.094
Q7	NonT1	49	2.51	.869	.124
	Title1	78	2.63	.884	.100
Q8	NonT1	49	2.96	.735	.105
	Title1	78	3.01	.693	.078
Q9	NonT1	49	2.24	.751	.107
	Title1	78	2.69	.795	.090
Q10	NonT1	49	2.96	.763	.109
	Title1	78	3.05	.804	.091
Q11	NonT1	49	3.02	.803	.115
	Title1	78	3.14	.817	.093
Q12	NonT1	49	2.88	.832	.119
	Title1	78	3.06	.727	.082
Q13	NonT1	49	2.78	.771	.110
	Title1	78	2.85	.774	.088
Q14	NonT1	49	2.67	.826	.118
	Title1	78	2.82	.769	.087

Independent Samples Test

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
									95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	Lower	Upper
Q1	Equal variances assumed	.158	.691	-1.953	124	.053	-.25	.129	-.508	.003
	Equal variances not assumed			-1.934	99.080	.056	-.25	.130	-.511	.006
Q2	Equal variances assumed	.032	.858	.012	124	.990	.00	.131	-.259	.262
	Equal variances not assumed			.012	98.720	.990	.00	.132	-.260	.263
Q3	Equal variances assumed	.040	.843	-.935	123	.352	-.11	.119	-.348	.125
	Equal variances not assumed			-.918	94.100	.361	-.11	.121	-.353	.130
Q4	Equal variances assumed	.003	.956	-1.570	122	.119	-.20	.127	-.451	.052
	Equal variances not assumed			-1.525	90.720	.131	-.20	.131	-.459	.060
Q5	Equal variances assumed	.540	.464	-.294	124	.769	-.04	.153	-.347	.257
	Equal variances not assumed			-.299	105.191	.765	-.04	.150	-.342	.253
Q6	Equal variances assumed	.326	.569	-.703	124	.483	-.11	.156	-.418	.199
	Equal variances not assumed			-.692	97.077	.490	-.11	.158	-.423	.204
Q7	Equal variances assumed	.010	.921	-.737	125	.463	-.12	.160	-.435	.199
	Equal variances not assumed			-.740	103.474	.461	-.12	.159	-.434	.198
Q8	Equal variances assumed	.680	.411	-.415	125	.679	-.05	.129	-.310	.202
	Equal variances not assumed			-.409	97.633	.683	-.05	.131	-.314	.206
Q9	Equal variances assumed	1.163	.283	-3.154	125	.002	-.45	.142	-.728	-.167
	Equal variances not assumed			-3.196	106.451	.002	-.45	.140	-.725	-.170
Q10	Equal variances assumed	.009	.924	-.641	125	.523	-.09	.144	-.377	.192
	Equal variances not assumed			-.649	106.179	.518	-.09	.142	-.374	.189
Q11	Equal variances assumed	.326	.569	-.815	125	.417	-.12	.148	-.414	.172
	Equal variances not assumed			-.818	103.458	.415	-.12	.147	-.413	.172
Q12	Equal variances assumed	1.046	.308	-1.331	125	.186	-.19	.140	-.464	.091
	Equal variances not assumed			-1.290	91.850	.200	-.19	.145	-.474	.101
Q13	Equal variances assumed	.066	.798	-.501	125	.617	-.07	.141	-.350	.208
	Equal variances not assumed			-.502	102.449	.617	-.07	.141	-.350	.209
Q14	Equal variances assumed	1.360	.246	-1.019	125	.310	-.15	.144	-.433	.138
	Equal variances not assumed			-1.003	96.571	.319	-.15	.147	-.438	.144

Descriptive Statistics of Educators' Perceived Implications of NCLB

Group Statistics

	POSITION	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Q.15	Princpl	47	2.43	.744	.109
	Teacher	85	2.00	.772	.084
Q.16	Princpl	47	2.02	.766	.112
	Teacher	85	1.74	.861	.093
Q.17	Princpl	46	1.52	.547	.081
	Teacher	85	1.41	.583	.063
Q.18	Princpl	47	2.36	.792	.116
	Teacher	85	2.24	.996	.108
Q.19	Princpl	47	1.72	.615	.090
	Teacher	85	1.52	.610	.066
Q.20	Princpl	47	1.83	.789	.115
	Teacher	85	1.53	.647	.070
Q.21	Princpl	47	2.85	.751	.110
	Teacher	85	2.89	.939	.102
Q.22	Princpl	47	2.38	.534	.078
	Teacher	85	2.75	.830	.090
Q.23	Princpl	47	2.17	.761	.111
	Teacher	85	1.88	.747	.081
Q.24	Princpl	47	3.62	.534	.078
	Teacher	84	3.57	.607	.066
Q.25	Princpl	47	2.57	.580	.085
	Teacher	85	2.40	.727	.079
Q.26	Princpl	47	2.83	.732	.107
	Teacher	85	2.98	.801	.087
Q.27	Princpl	47	1.96	.658	.096
	Teacher	85	1.84	.705	.076
Q.28	Princpl	47	2.23	.633	.092
	Teacher	85	1.93	.799	.087
Q.29	Princpl	47	2.57	.744	.109
	Teacher	85	2.61	.742	.080
Q.30	Princpl	47	3.28	.579	.084
	Teacher	85	3.44	.645	.070
Q.31	Princpl	46	1.87	.749	.110
	Teacher	85	1.81	.779	.085
Q.32	Princpl	47	3.06	.763	.111
	Teacher	85	3.13	.737	.080
Q.33	Princpl	47	1.36	.673	.098
	Teacher	85	1.59	.863	.094
Q.34	Princpl	47	1.40	.577	.084
	Teacher	85	1.47	.700	.076
Q.35	Princpl	47	1.98	.608	.089
	Teacher	85	1.95	.671	.073

Independent Samples Test

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
									95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	Lower	Upper
Q.15	Equal variances assumed	.937	.335	3.072	130	.003	.43	.139	.151	.700
	Equal variances not assumed			3.104	97.950	.002	.43	.137	.153	.698
Q.16	Equal variances assumed	3.666	.058	1.859	130	.065	.28	.151	-.018	.578
	Equal variances not assumed			1.924	104.773	.057	.28	.146	-.009	.569
Q.17	Equal variances assumed	.001	.972	1.052	129	.295	.11	.105	-.097	.317
	Equal variances not assumed			1.072	97.591	.286	.11	.103	-.094	.313
Q.18	Equal variances assumed	4.990	.027	.749	130	.455	.13	.169	-.208	.460
	Equal variances not assumed			.799	113.909	.426	.13	.158	-.187	.440
Q.19	Equal variances assumed	.592	.443	1.851	130	.066	.21	.111	-.014	.426
	Equal variances not assumed			1.846	94.311	.068	.21	.111	-.016	.427
Q.20	Equal variances assumed	.630	.429	2.359	130	.020	.30	.127	.048	.552
	Equal variances not assumed			2.228	80.484	.029	.30	.135	.032	.569
Q.21	Equal variances assumed	4.142	.044	-.270	130	.788	-.04	.159	-.358	.272
	Equal variances not assumed			-.288	113.439	.774	-.04	.150	-.339	.253
Q.22	Equal variances assumed	8.540	.004	-2.756	130	.007	-.37	.134	-.636	-.104
	Equal variances not assumed			-3.109	126.935	.002	-.37	.119	-.605	-.134
Q.23	Equal variances assumed	.576	.449	2.107	130	.037	.29	.137	.018	.558
	Equal variances not assumed			2.095	93.494	.039	.29	.137	.015	.561
Q.24	Equal variances assumed	1.330	.251	.430	129	.668	.05	.106	-.164	.255
	Equal variances not assumed			.446	105.904	.656	.05	.102	-.157	.248
Q.25	Equal variances assumed	5.485	.021	1.414	130	.160	.17	.123	-.070	.419
	Equal variances not assumed			1.508	113.630	.134	.17	.116	-.055	.404
Q.26	Equal variances assumed	.307	.581	-1.038	130	.301	-.15	.141	-.426	.133
	Equal variances not assumed			-1.065	102.539	.289	-.15	.138	-.420	.126
Q.27	Equal variances assumed	2.377	.126	.976	130	.331	.12	.125	-.125	.370
	Equal variances not assumed			.996	100.657	.322	.12	.123	-.121	.366
Q.28	Equal variances assumed	1.996	.160	2.252	130	.026	.30	.135	.037	.572
	Equal variances not assumed			2.406	114.187	.018	.30	.127	.054	.555
Q.29	Equal variances assumed	.006	.939	-.276	130	.783	-.04	.135	-.304	.230
	Equal variances not assumed			-.276	94.713	.783	-.04	.135	-.306	.231
Q.30	Equal variances assumed	3.391	.068	-1.404	130	.163	-.16	.113	-.382	.065
	Equal variances not assumed			-1.448	103.961	.151	-.16	.110	-.376	.059
Q.31	Equal variances assumed	.818	.367	.411	129	.682	.06	.141	-.221	.336
	Equal variances not assumed			.416	95.619	.678	.06	.139	-.218	.334
Q.32	Equal variances assumed	.144	.705	-.484	130	.630	-.07	.136	-.334	.203
	Equal variances not assumed			-.479	92.174	.633	-.07	.137	-.338	.207
Q.33	Equal variances assumed	5.719	.018	-1.556	130	.122	-.23	.146	-.515	.062
	Equal variances not assumed			-1.670	115.410	.098	-.23	.136	-.495	.042
Q.34	Equal variances assumed	1.340	.249	-.554	130	.581	-.07	.120	-.303	.171
	Equal variances not assumed			-.585	111.062	.560	-.07	.113	-.291	.158
Q.35	Equal variances assumed	1.237	.268	.218	130	.827	.03	.118	-.208	.259
	Equal variances not assumed			.225	103.247	.823	.03	.115	-.202	.253

T – TEST Of Principals vs. Teachers Perceived Implications of NCLB

Group Statistics

	POSITION	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Q.15	Princpl	47	2.43	.744	.109
	Teacher	85	2.00	.772	.084
Q.16	Princpl	47	2.02	.766	.112
	Teacher	85	1.74	.861	.093
Q.17	Princpl	46	1.52	.547	.081
	Teacher	85	1.41	.583	.063
Q.18	Princpl	47	2.36	.792	.116
	Teacher	85	2.24	.996	.108
Q.19	Princpl	47	1.72	.615	.090
	Teacher	85	1.52	.610	.066
Q.20	Princpl	47	1.83	.789	.115
	Teacher	85	1.53	.647	.070
Q.21	Princpl	47	2.85	.751	.110
	Teacher	85	2.89	.939	.102
Q.22	Princpl	47	2.38	.534	.078
	Teacher	85	2.75	.830	.090
Q.23	Princpl	47	2.17	.761	.111
	Teacher	85	1.88	.747	.081
Q.24	Princpl	47	3.62	.534	.078
	Teacher	84	3.57	.607	.066
Q.25	Princpl	47	2.57	.580	.085
	Teacher	85	2.40	.727	.079
Q.26	Princpl	47	2.83	.732	.107
	Teacher	85	2.98	.801	.087
Q.27	Princpl	47	1.96	.658	.096
	Teacher	85	1.84	.705	.076
Q.28	Princpl	47	2.23	.633	.092
	Teacher	85	1.93	.799	.087
Q.29	Princpl	47	2.57	.744	.109
	Teacher	85	2.61	.742	.080
Q.30	Princpl	47	3.28	.579	.084
	Teacher	85	3.44	.645	.070
Q.31	Princpl	46	1.87	.749	.110
	Teacher	85	1.81	.779	.085
Q.32	Princpl	47	3.06	.763	.111
	Teacher	85	3.13	.737	.080
Q.33	Princpl	47	1.36	.673	.098
	Teacher	85	1.59	.863	.094
Q.34	Princpl	47	1.40	.577	.084
	Teacher	85	1.47	.700	.076
Q.35	Princpl	47	1.98	.608	.089
	Teacher	85	1.95	.671	.073

Independent Samples Test

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
									95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	Lower	Upper
Q.15	Equal variances assumed	.937	.335	3.072	130	.003	.43	.139	.151	.700
	Equal variances not assumed			3.104	97.950	.002	.43	.137	.153	.698
Q.16	Equal variances assumed	3.666	.058	1.859	130	.065	.28	.151	-.018	.578
	Equal variances not assumed			1.924	104.773	.057	.28	.146	-.009	.569
Q.17	Equal variances assumed	.001	.972	1.052	129	.295	.11	.105	-.097	.317
	Equal variances not assumed			1.072	97.591	.286	.11	.103	-.094	.313
Q.18	Equal variances assumed	4.990	.027	.749	130	.455	.13	.169	-.208	.460
	Equal variances not assumed			.799	113.909	.426	.13	.158	-.187	.440
Q.19	Equal variances assumed	.592	.443	1.851	130	.066	.21	.111	-.014	.426
	Equal variances not assumed			1.846	94.311	.068	.21	.111	-.016	.427
Q.20	Equal variances assumed	.630	.429	2.359	130	.020	.30	.127	.048	.552
	Equal variances not assumed			2.228	80.484	.029	.30	.135	.032	.569
Q.21	Equal variances assumed	4.142	.044	-.270	130	.788	-.04	.159	-.358	.272
	Equal variances not assumed			-.288	113.439	.774	-.04	.150	-.339	.253
Q.22	Equal variances assumed	8.540	.004	-2.756	130	.007	-.37	.134	-.636	-.104
	Equal variances not assumed			-3.109	126.935	.002	-.37	.119	-.605	-.134
Q.23	Equal variances assumed	.576	.449	2.107	130	.037	.29	.137	.018	.558
	Equal variances not assumed			2.095	93.494	.039	.29	.137	.015	.561
Q.24	Equal variances assumed	1.330	.251	.430	129	.668	.05	.106	-.164	.255
	Equal variances not assumed			.446	105.904	.656	.05	.102	-.157	.248
Q.25	Equal variances assumed	5.485	.021	1.414	130	.160	.17	.123	-.070	.419
	Equal variances not assumed			1.508	113.630	.134	.17	.116	-.055	.404
Q.26	Equal variances assumed	.307	.581	-1.038	130	.301	-.15	.141	-.426	.133
	Equal variances not assumed			-1.065	102.539	.289	-.15	.138	-.420	.126
Q.27	Equal variances assumed	2.377	.126	.976	130	.331	.12	.125	-.125	.370
	Equal variances not assumed			.996	100.657	.322	.12	.123	-.121	.366
Q.28	Equal variances assumed	1.996	.160	2.252	130	.026	.30	.135	.037	.572
	Equal variances not assumed			2.406	114.187	.018	.30	.127	.054	.555
Q.29	Equal variances assumed	.006	.939	-.276	130	.783	-.04	.135	-.304	.230
	Equal variances not assumed			-.276	94.713	.783	-.04	.135	-.306	.231
Q.30	Equal variances assumed	3.391	.068	-1.404	130	.163	-.16	.113	-.382	.065
	Equal variances not assumed			-1.448	103.961	.151	-.16	.110	-.376	.059
Q.31	Equal variances assumed	.818	.367	.411	129	.682	.06	.141	-.221	.336
	Equal variances not assumed			.416	95.619	.678	.06	.139	-.218	.334
Q.32	Equal variances assumed	.144	.705	-.484	130	.630	-.07	.136	-.334	.203
	Equal variances not assumed			-.479	92.174	.633	-.07	.137	-.338	.207
Q.33	Equal variances assumed	5.719	.018	-1.556	130	.122	-.23	.146	-.515	.062
	Equal variances not assumed			-1.670	115.410	.098	-.23	.136	-.495	.042
Q.34	Equal variances assumed	1.340	.249	-.554	130	.581	-.07	.120	-.303	.171
	Equal variances not assumed			-.585	111.062	.560	-.07	.113	-.291	.158
Q.35	Equal variances assumed	1.237	.268	.218	130	.827	.03	.118	-.208	.259
	Equal variances not assumed			.225	103.247	.823	.03	.115	-.202	.253

T-Test of Title I and Non-Title I Educators' Perceived Implications of No Child Left Behind

Group Statistics

	TYPE	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Q.15	NonT1	49	1.98	.777	.111
	Title1	78	2.27	.784	.089
Q.16	NonT1	49	1.76	.804	.115
	Title1	78	1.90	.862	.098
Q.17	NonT1	49	1.39	.571	.082
	Title1	77	1.52	.576	.066
Q.18	NonT1	49	2.31	.983	.140
	Title1	78	2.26	.889	.101
Q.19	NonT1	49	1.47	.616	.088
	Title1	78	1.67	.596	.067
Q.20	NonT1	49	1.51	.681	.097
	Title1	78	1.73	.733	.083
Q.21	NonT1	49	2.98	.878	.125
	Title1	78	2.81	.884	.100
Q.22	NonT1	49	2.61	.731	.104
	Title1	78	2.63	.775	.088
Q.23	NonT1	49	2.02	.829	.118
	Title1	78	1.97	.683	.077
Q.24	NonT1	49	3.63	.566	.081
	Title1	77	3.57	.572	.065
Q.25	NonT1	49	2.35	.805	.115
	Title1	78	2.54	.574	.065
Q.26	NonT1	49	2.76	.778	.111
	Title1	78	3.00	.756	.086
Q.27	NonT1	49	1.65	.561	.080
	Title1	78	2.00	.721	.082
Q.28	NonT1	49	2.04	.763	.109
	Title1	78	2.05	.737	.083
Q.29	NonT1	49	2.51	.649	.093
	Title1	78	2.69	.778	.088
Q.30	NonT1	49	3.47	.616	.088
	Title1	78	3.33	.617	.070
Q.31	NonT1	49	1.59	.643	.092
	Title1	77	2.00	.811	.092
Q.32	NonT1	49	3.14	.791	.113
	Title1	78	3.06	.690	.078
Q.33	NonT1	49	1.24	.522	.075
	Title1	78	1.67	.907	.103
Q.34	NonT1	49	1.27	.446	.064
	Title1	78	1.56	.731	.083
Q.35	NonT1	49	1.84	.590	.084
	Title1	78	2.04	.673	.076

Independent Samples Test

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
									95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	Lower	Upper
Q.15	Equal variances assumed	.508	.477	-2.033	125	.044	-.29	.142	-.572	-.008
	Equal variances not assumed			-2.038	102.830	.044	-.29	.142	-.572	-.008
Q.16	Equal variances assumed	.014	.906	-.929	125	.355	-.14	.153	-.445	.161
	Equal variances not assumed			-.944	107.368	.347	-.14	.151	-.441	.157
Q.17	Equal variances assumed	.702	.404	-1.256	124	.212	-.13	.105	-.339	.076
	Equal variances not assumed			-1.258	103.062	.211	-.13	.105	-.339	.076
Q.18	Equal variances assumed	1.622	.205	.294	125	.769	.05	.169	-.285	.384
	Equal variances not assumed			.288	94.442	.774	.05	.173	-.293	.393
Q.19	Equal variances assumed	.292	.590	-1.793	125	.075	-.20	.110	-.415	.020
	Equal variances not assumed			-1.779	99.581	.078	-.20	.111	-.417	.023
Q.20	Equal variances assumed	.049	.825	-1.696	125	.092	-.22	.130	-.478	.037
	Equal variances not assumed			-1.725	107.728	.087	-.22	.128	-.474	.033
Q.21	Equal variances assumed	.026	.872	1.070	125	.287	.17	.161	-.146	.490
	Equal variances not assumed			1.072	102.638	.286	.17	.160	-.146	.490
Q.22	Equal variances assumed	.146	.703	-.115	125	.908	-.02	.138	-.289	.258
	Equal variances not assumed			-.117	106.589	.907	-.02	.136	-.286	.254
Q.23	Equal variances assumed	2.444	.121	.340	125	.734	.05	.135	-.222	.314
	Equal variances not assumed			.326	87.757	.746	.05	.141	-.235	.327
Q.24	Equal variances assumed	.418	.519	.588	124	.558	.06	.104	-.145	.267
	Equal variances not assumed			.589	103.110	.557	.06	.104	-.145	.267
Q.25	Equal variances assumed	14.665	.000	-1.563	125	.121	-.19	.123	-.434	.051
	Equal variances not assumed			-1.450	78.583	.151	-.19	.132	-.454	.071
Q.26	Equal variances assumed	1.812	.181	-1.757	125	.081	-.24	.139	-.521	.031
	Equal variances not assumed			-1.746	99.901	.084	-.24	.140	-.523	.033
Q.27	Equal variances assumed	.007	.934	-2.867	125	.005	-.35	.121	-.586	-.107
	Equal variances not assumed			-3.033	119.243	.003	-.35	.114	-.573	-.120
Q.28	Equal variances assumed	.012	.914	-.077	125	.939	-.01	.136	-.280	.259
	Equal variances not assumed			-.076	99.467	.939	-.01	.137	-.283	.262
Q.29	Equal variances assumed	.790	.376	-1.366	125	.174	-.18	.133	-.446	.082
	Equal variances not assumed			-1.423	115.201	.157	-.18	.128	-.436	.071
Q.30	Equal variances assumed	.112	.738	1.210	125	.228	.14	.112	-.086	.359
	Equal variances not assumed			1.211	102.298	.229	.14	.112	-.087	.359
Q.31	Equal variances assumed	.414	.521	-2.976	124	.004	-.41	.137	-.680	-.137
	Equal variances not assumed			-3.132	118.018	.002	-.41	.130	-.666	-.150
Q.32	Equal variances assumed	1.580	.211	.592	125	.555	.08	.133	-.185	.342
	Equal variances not assumed			.573	91.844	.568	.08	.137	-.194	.352
Q.33	Equal variances assumed	19.892	.000	-2.960	125	.004	-.42	.143	-.704	-.140
	Equal variances not assumed			-3.324	124.200	.001	-.42	.127	-.673	-.171
Q.34	Equal variances assumed	15.460	.000	-2.573	125	.011	-.30	.116	-.529	-.069
	Equal variances not assumed			-2.860	124.923	.005	-.30	.104	-.506	-.092
Q.35	Equal variances assumed	.091	.764	-1.723	125	.087	-.20	.117	-.433	.030
	Equal variances not assumed			-1.776	111.964	.079	-.20	.114	-.427	.023

Frequencies of Educators' Perceived Implications of NCLB

Case Processing Summary

	Cases					
	Valid		Missing		Total	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
POSITION * Q.15	133	98.5%	2	1.5%	135	100.0%
POSITION * Q.16	133	98.5%	2	1.5%	135	100.0%
POSITION * Q.17	132	97.8%	3	2.2%	135	100.0%
POSITION * Q.18	133	98.5%	2	1.5%	135	100.0%
POSITION * Q.19	133	98.5%	2	1.5%	135	100.0%
POSITION * Q.20	133	98.5%	2	1.5%	135	100.0%
POSITION * Q.21	133	98.5%	2	1.5%	135	100.0%
POSITION * Q.22	133	98.5%	2	1.5%	135	100.0%
POSITION * Q.23	133	98.5%	2	1.5%	135	100.0%
POSITION * Q.24	132	97.8%	3	2.2%	135	100.0%
POSITION * Q.25	133	98.5%	2	1.5%	135	100.0%
POSITION * Q.26	133	98.5%	2	1.5%	135	100.0%
POSITION * Q.27	133	98.5%	2	1.5%	135	100.0%
POSITION * Q.28	133	98.5%	2	1.5%	135	100.0%
POSITION * Q.29	133	98.5%	2	1.5%	135	100.0%
POSITION * Q.30	133	98.5%	2	1.5%	135	100.0%
POSITION * Q.31	132	97.8%	3	2.2%	135	100.0%
POSITION * Q.32	133	98.5%	2	1.5%	135	100.0%
POSITION * Q.33	133	98.5%	2	1.5%	135	100.0%
POSITION * Q.34	133	98.5%	2	1.5%	135	100.0%
POSITION * Q.35	133	98.5%	2	1.5%	135	100.0%

POSITION * Q.15 Crosstabulation

			Q.15				
			1	2	3	4	Total
POSITION		Count		1			1
		% within POSITION		100.0%			100.0%
	Princpl	Count	5	19	21	2	47
		% within POSITION	10.6%	40.4%	44.7%	4.3%	100.0%
	Teacher	Count	24	38	22	1	85
		% within POSITION	28.2%	44.7%	25.9%	1.2%	100.0%
Total		Count	29	58	43	3	133
		% within POSITION	21.8%	43.6%	32.3%	2.3%	100.0%

POSITION * Q.16 Crosstabulation

			Q.16				
			1	2	3	4	Total
POSITION		Count		1			1
		% within POSITION		100.0%			100.0%
	Princpl	Count	12	23	11	1	47
		% within POSITION	25.5%	48.9%	23.4%	2.1%	100.0%
	Teacher	Count	41	29	11	4	85
		% within POSITION	48.2%	34.1%	12.9%	4.7%	100.0%
Total		Count	53	53	22	5	133
		% within POSITION	39.8%	39.8%	16.5%	3.8%	100.0%

POSITION * Q.17 Crosstabulation

			Q.17			
			1	2	3	Total
POSITION		Count		1		1
		% within POSITION		100.0%		100.0%
	Princpl	Count	23	22	1	46
		% within POSITION	50.0%	47.8%	2.2%	100.0%
	Teacher	Count	54	27	4	85
		% within POSITION	63.5%	31.8%	4.7%	100.0%
Total		Count	77	50	5	132
		% within POSITION	58.3%	37.9%	3.8%	100.0%

POSITION * Q.18 Crosstabulation

			Q.18				
			1	2	3	4	Total
POSITION		Count		1			1
		% within POSITION		100.0%			100.0%
	Princpl	Count	8	15	23	1	47
		% within POSITION	17.0%	31.9%	48.9%	2.1%	100.0%
	Teacher	Count	26	21	30	8	85
		% within POSITION	30.6%	24.7%	35.3%	9.4%	100.0%
Total		Count	34	37	53	9	133
		% within POSITION	25.6%	27.8%	39.8%	6.8%	100.0%

POSITION * Q.19 Crosstabulation

			Q.19			
			1	2	3	Total
POSITION		Count		1		1
		% within POSITION		100.0%		100.0%
	Princpl	Count	17	26	4	47
		% within POSITION	36.2%	55.3%	8.5%	100.0%
	Teacher	Count	46	34	5	85
		% within POSITION	54.1%	40.0%	5.9%	100.0%
Total		Count	63	61	9	133
		% within POSITION	47.4%	45.9%	6.8%	100.0%

POSITION * Q.20 Crosstabulation

			Q.20				
			1	2	3	4	Total
POSITION		Count		1			1
		% within POSITION		100.0%			100.0%
	Princpl	Count	18	20	8	1	47
		% within POSITION	38.3%	42.6%	17.0%	2.1%	100.0%
	Teacher	Count	47	31	7		85
		% within POSITION	55.3%	36.5%	8.2%		100.0%
Total		Count	65	52	15	1	133
		% within POSITION	48.9%	39.1%	11.3%	.8%	100.0%

POSITION * Q.21 Crosstabulation

			Q.21				
			1	2	3	4	Total
POSITION		Count			1		1
		% within POSITION			100.0%		100.0%
	Princpl	Count	2	11	26	8	47
		% within POSITION	4.3%	23.4%	55.3%	17.0%	100.0%
	Teacher	Count	7	21	31	26	85
		% within POSITION	8.2%	24.7%	36.5%	30.6%	100.0%
Total		Count	9	32	58	34	133
		% within POSITION	6.8%	24.1%	43.6%	25.6%	100.0%

POSITION * Q.22 Crosstabulation

			Q.22				
			1	2	3	4	Total
POSITION		Count			1		1
		% within POSITION			100.0%		100.0%
	Princpl	Count	1	27	19		47
		% within POSITION	2.1%	57.4%	40.4%		100.0%
	Teacher	Count	4	30	34	17	85
		% within POSITION	4.7%	35.3%	40.0%	20.0%	100.0%
Total		Count	5	57	54	17	133
		% within POSITION	3.8%	42.9%	40.6%	12.8%	100.0%

POSITION * Q.23 Crosstabulation

			Q.23				
			1	2	3	4	Total
POSITION		Count		1			1
		% within POSITION		100.0%			100.0%
	Princpl	Count	9	22	15	1	47
		% within POSITION	19.1%	46.8%	31.9%	2.1%	100.0%
	Teacher	Count	26	46	10	3	85
		% within POSITION	30.6%	54.1%	11.8%	3.5%	100.0%
Total		Count	35	69	25	4	133
		% within POSITION	26.3%	51.9%	18.8%	3.0%	100.0%

POSITION * Q.24 Crosstabulation

			Q.24			
			2	3	4	Total
POSITION		Count		1		1
		% within POSITION		100.0%		100.0%
	Princpl	Count	1	16	30	47
		% within POSITION	2.1%	34.0%	63.8%	100.0%
	Teacher	Count	5	26	53	84
		% within POSITION	6.0%	31.0%	63.1%	100.0%
Total		Count	6	43	83	132
		% within POSITION	4.5%	32.6%	62.9%	100.0%

POSITION * Q.25 Crosstabulation

			Q.25			
			1	2	3	Total
POSITION		Count			1	1
		% within POSITION			100.0%	100.0%
	Princpl	Count	2	16	29	47
		% within POSITION	4.3%	34.0%	61.7%	100.0%
	Teacher	Count	12	27	46	85
		% within POSITION	14.1%	31.8%	54.1%	100.0%
Total		Count	14	43	76	133
		% within POSITION	10.5%	32.3%	57.1%	100.0%

POSITION * Q.26 Crosstabulation

			Q.26				
			1	2	3	4	Total
POSITION		Count		1			1
		% within POSITION		100.0%			100.0%
	Princpl	Count	1	14	24	8	47
		% within POSITION	2.1%	29.8%	51.1%	17.0%	100.0%
	Teacher	Count	1	25	34	25	85
		% within POSITION	1.2%	29.4%	40.0%	29.4%	100.0%
Total		Count	2	40	58	33	133
		% within POSITION	1.5%	30.1%	43.6%	24.8%	100.0%

POSITION * Q.27 Crosstabulation

			Q.27			
			1	2	3	Total
POSITION		Count		1		1
		% within POSITION		100.0%		100.0%
	Princpl	Count	11	27	9	47
		% within POSITION	23.4%	57.4%	19.1%	100.0%
	Teacher	Count	29	41	15	85
		% within POSITION	34.1%	48.2%	17.6%	100.0%
Total		Count	40	69	24	133
		% within POSITION	30.1%	51.9%	18.0%	100.0%

POSITION * Q.28 Crosstabulation

			Q.28				
			1	2	3	4	Total
POSITION		Count		1			1
		% within POSITION		100.0%			100.0%
	Princpl	Count	5	26	16		47
		% within POSITION	10.6%	55.3%	34.0%		100.0%
	Teacher	Count	29	34	21	1	85
		% within POSITION	34.1%	40.0%	24.7%	1.2%	100.0%
Total		Count	34	61	37	1	133
		% within POSITION	25.6%	45.9%	27.8%	.8%	100.0%

POSITION * Q.29 Crosstabulation

			Q.29				
			1	2	3	4	Total
POSITION		Count			1		1
		% within POSITION			100.0%		100.0%
	Princpl	Count	3	18	22	4	47
		% within POSITION	6.4%	38.3%	46.8%	8.5%	100.0%
	Teacher	Count	5	31	41	8	85
		% within POSITION	5.9%	36.5%	48.2%	9.4%	100.0%
Total		Count	8	49	64	12	133
		% within POSITION	6.0%	36.8%	48.1%	9.0%	100.0%

POSITION * Q.30 Crosstabulation

			Q.30			
			2	3	4	Total
POSITION		Count		1		1
		% within POSITION		100.0%		100.0%
	Princpl	Count	3	28	16	47
		% within POSITION	6.4%	59.6%	34.0%	100.0%
	Teacher	Count	7	34	44	85
		% within POSITION	8.2%	40.0%	51.8%	100.0%
Total		Count	10	63	60	133
		% within POSITION	7.5%	47.4%	45.1%	100.0%

POSITION * Q.31 Crosstabulation

			Q.31				
			1	2	3	4	Total
POSITION		Count		1			1
		% within POSITION		100.0%			100.0%
	Princpl	Count	14	26	4	2	46
		% within POSITION	30.4%	56.5%	8.7%	4.3%	100.0%
	Teacher	Count	32	40	10	3	85
		% within POSITION	37.6%	47.1%	11.8%	3.5%	100.0%
Total		Count	46	67	14	5	132
		% within POSITION	34.8%	50.8%	10.6%	3.8%	100.0%

POSITION * Q.32 Crosstabulation

			Q.32				
			1	2	3	4	Total
POSITION		Count		1			1
		% within POSITION		100.0%			100.0%
	Princpl	Count	2	6	26	13	47
		% within POSITION	4.3%	12.8%	55.3%	27.7%	100.0%
	Teacher	Count	2	12	44	27	85
		% within POSITION	2.4%	14.1%	51.8%	31.8%	100.0%
Total		Count	4	19	70	40	133
		% within POSITION	3.0%	14.3%	52.6%	30.1%	100.0%

POSITION * Q.33 Crosstabulation

			Q.33				
			1	2	3	4	Total
POSITION		Count	1				1
		% within POSITION	100.0%				100.0%
	Princpl	Count	34	10	2	1	47
		% within POSITION	72.3%	21.3%	4.3%	2.1%	100.0%
	Teacher	Count	52	20	9	4	85
		% within POSITION	61.2%	23.5%	10.6%	4.7%	100.0%
Total		Count	87	30	11	5	133
		% within POSITION	65.4%	22.6%	8.3%	3.8%	100.0%

POSITION * Q.34 Crosstabulation

			Q.34				
			1	2	3	4	Total
POSITION		Count		1			1
		% within POSITION		100.0%			100.0%
	Princpl	Count	30	15	2		47
		% within POSITION	63.8%	31.9%	4.3%		100.0%
	Teacher	Count	53	26	4	2	85
		% within POSITION	62.4%	30.6%	4.7%	2.4%	100.0%
Total		Count	83	42	6	2	133
		% within POSITION	62.4%	31.6%	4.5%	1.5%	100.0%

POSITION * Q.35 Crosstabulation

			Q.35			
			1	2	3	Total
POSITION		Count		1		1
		% within POSITION		100.0%		100.0%
	Princpl	Count	9	30	8	47
		% within POSITION	19.1%	63.8%	17.0%	100.0%
	Teacher	Count	21	47	17	85
		% within POSITION	24.7%	55.3%	20.0%	100.0%
Total		Count	30	78	25	133
		% within POSITION	22.6%	58.6%	18.8%	100.0%